

PRELUDE TO EMPIRE

Babylonian Society and Politics, 747-626 B.C.

by
J. A. Brinkman

Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund, 7
Philadelphia, 1984

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Brinkman, J. A. (John Anthony), 1934-

Prelude to Empire

(Occasional publications of the Babylonian Fund ; 7)

Bibliography

Includes indexes.

I. Babylonia—History. I. Title. II. Series.

DS73.7 B75 1984 935'.03 84-25556

ISBN 0-934718-62-6

For Monique

Copyright © by J. A. Brinkman.

Printed in the United States of America.

Distributed by The Babylonian Fund,
University Museum, Philadelphia, Pa.

All rights reserved. This book may not be
reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form
(except by reviewers for the public press),
without written permission from the publishers.

*quale solet silvis brumali frigore viscum
fronde virere nova quod non sua seminat arbos
et croceo fetu teretis circumdare truncos*

PREFACE

This monograph originated as a chapter for the revised edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 3/2. Because the series format could not readily accommodate explanatory documentation, it was decided to make the text available separately with significantly expanded footnotes and certain stylistic adjustments.

The result is an annotated interpretive essay on Babylonian history covering a period of slightly more than a century (747-626 B.C.) immediately preceding the rise of the Neo-Babylonian empire under Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar II. These years represent a brief but crucial transition between the lowest ebb in Babylonia's fortunes, the era of disruption marked by Aramean and Chaldean infiltrations (1080-748), and the apogee of her political power under the Neo-Babylonian dynasty (625-539). This period is richly documented, but serious historians have often been intimidated by the sheer volume of contemporary letters and economic texts, for which essential studies in prosopography, geography, and dating are still lacking. The purpose of the present essay is to provide a rough sketch map for relatively uncharted territory and to initiate a dialogue among historians on many formidable problems of interpretation. Footnotes are designed to be propaedeutic and explanatory rather than exhaustive (especially in citing Assyrian royal inscriptions).

I am indebted to many colleagues and students who have helped shape this book, and I wish that I could mention them all by name. I am particularly grateful to Douglas Kennedy for generously sharing information on Babylonian economic texts and for collaborating on a variety of projects over the past decade and a half. I owe much to Crant Frame for his careful reading of an early draft of this manuscript and for permission to use his detailed study of Babylonian political history from 689 to 627 B.C., which has been of considerable help even where we have differed on matters of interpretation. I have benefitted from the generosity of A. Kirk Grayson, who made available to me his manuscript for the *Cambridge Ancient History* chapters on Assyria between 745 and 635 B.C. I wish to thank Robert McC. Adams and Matthew W. Stolper for their critical comments on the original manuscript. I am also indebted to Mr. Stolper for allowing me to consult before publication his survey of Elamite political history. The final form of this monograph owes much to John E.

Llewellyn and Donna Freilich, who provided editorial and bibliographical assistance well beyond the call of duty.

J. A. Brinkman

Oriental Institute
University of Chicago
April 2, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	vii
List of Abbreviations	xi
Introduction	1
I. Institutional Landscape and General Trends	3
II. Initial Assyrian Involvement in Babylonia, 747-722 B.C.	39
III. The Chaldean Struggle for Independence, 721-689 B.C.	45
IV. Babylon: Destruction and Rebirth, 689-669 B.C.	67
V. Sibling Monarchs: Shamasb-shum-ukin and Ashurbanipal, 669-653 B.C.	85
VI. The Great Rebellion (652-648 B.C.) and Its Aftermath: Shamasb-shum-ukin and His Allies vs. Ashurbanipal	93
VII. Kandalanu and the Decline of Assyrian Power, 647-626	105
VIII. Note on Sources	113
Conclusion	123
Chronological Chart	126
Bibliography	129
General Index	151
Index of Akkadian Words	159

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.	siglum of tablets, etc. in the Assur collection of the Istanbul Archeological Museums
ABL	R.F. Harper, <i>Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the K(ouyunjik) Collection(s) of the British Museum</i>
ADD	C.H.W. Johns, <i>Assyrian Deeds and Documents</i>
AfK	<i>Archiv für Keilschriftforschung</i>
AfO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AHw	W. von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i>
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJSL	<i>The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
<i>Ancient Arabs</i>	I. Eph'al, <i>The Ancient Arabs: Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent, 9th-5th Centuries B.C.</i>
ANEP	J.B. Pritchard, <i>The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament</i>
ANET	J.B. Pritchard, ed., <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i>
AnOr	<i>Analecta Orientalia</i>
AnSt	<i>Anatolian Studies</i>
AOAT	<i>Alter Orient und Altes Testament</i>
AOS	<i>American Oriental Series</i>
ARAB	D.D. Luckenbill, <i>Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia</i>
ARINH	F.M. Fales, ed., <i>Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis</i>
<i>L'armée</i>	F. Malbran-Labat, <i>L'armée et l'organisation militaire de l'Assyrie</i>
ArOr	<i>Archiv Orientalni</i>
ARU	J. Kohler and A. Ungnad, <i>Assyrische Rechtsurkunden</i>
AS	<i>Assyriological Studies</i>
Asarh.	R. Borger, <i>Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien</i>
Asb.	M. Streck, <i>Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's</i>
Assurbanipal	T. Bauer, <i>Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals</i>
AUSS	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
B	siglum (infix) for excavation numbers from the Iraqi excavations in Babylon

Abbreviations

Babylon	E. Unger, <i>Babylon, die heilige Stadt nach der Beschreibung der Babylonier</i>
Bagh. Mitt.	<i>Baghdader Mitteilungen</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBS ^t	L.W. King, <i>Babylonian Boundary-Stones and Memorial Tablets in the British Museum</i>
BE	<i>The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts</i>
Berens	T.G. Pinches, <i>The Babylonian Tablets of the Berens Collection</i>
BHLT	A.K. Grayson, <i>Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts</i>
BIN	<i>Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies</i>
BiOr	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i>
Bischof	B. Landsberger, <i>Brief des Bischofs von Esagila an König Asarhaddon</i>
Bit rimki	J. Laessøe, <i>Studies on the Assyrian Ritual and Series bit rimki</i>
BM	British Museum (siglum for objects in the British Museum, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities)
BMQ	<i>The British Museum Quarterly</i>
BR 8/7	M. San Nicolò, <i>Babylonische Rechtsurkunden des ausgehenden 8. und des 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.</i>
BRM	<i>Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan</i>
BSMS	<i>Bulletin: The Society for Mesopotamian Studies</i>
BWL	W.G. Lambert, <i>Babylonian Wisdom Literature</i>
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i>
CAH	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i>
CBI	C.B.F. Walker, <i>Cuneiform Brick Inscriptions in the British Museum; the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, the City of Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery; the City of Bristol Museum and Art Gallery</i>
CBQ	<i>The Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
Censimenti	F.M. Fales, <i>Censimenti e catasti di epoca neo-assira</i>
Chronicles	D.J. Wiseman, <i>Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (626-556 B.C.) in the British Museum</i>
CT	<i>Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets, etc., in the British Museum</i>
CTN	<i>Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud</i>
DAFI	<i>Cahiers de la Délégation archéologique française en Iran</i>

Abbreviations

DCEHE	<i>Documents cunéiformes de la IV^e Section de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études</i>
Deportation and Deportees	B. Oded, <i>Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire</i>
Diakonoff Fs.	M. Dandamayev et al., eds., <i>Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff</i>
diss.	dissertation
Divination	J. Nougayrol, ed., <i>La divination en Mésopotamie ancienne et dans les régions voisines</i>
Doomsday Book	C.H.W. Johns, <i>An Assyrian Doomsday Book or Liber Censualis of the District round Harran; in the Seventh Century B.C.</i>
DŠ	siglum for excavation numbers from the American expedition to Khorsabad (Dūr-Šarrukēn)
D.T.	siglum for tablets, etc., in the British Museum, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities ("Daily Telegraph")
Environmental History	W.C. Brice, ed., <i>The Environmental History of the Near and Middle East since the Last Ice Age</i>
Épithètes	M.-J. Seux, <i>Épithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes</i>
FB	<i>Forschungen und Berichte</i>
FG+H	F. Jacoby, ed., <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i>
CCCI	R.P. Dougherty, <i>Coucher College Cuneiform Inscriptions</i>
Cebete	J.A. Knudtzon, <i>Assyrische Cebete an den Sonnengott für Staat und königliches Haus aus der Zeit Asarhaddons und Asurbanipals</i>
Handerhebung	E. Ebeling, <i>Die akkadische Cebetsserie "Handerhebung"</i>
HKL	R. Borger, <i>Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur</i>
Huitième Congrès	J.N. Strassmaier, "Einige kleinere babylonische Keilschrifttexte aus dem Britischen Museum," in <i>Actes du Huitième Congrès International des Orientalistes, tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiania</i> (II/1 Section sémitique [B]), pp. 279-283
ICO	International Congress of Orientalists, Proceedings
IM	siglum for tablets, etc., in the Iraq Museum
JA	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>

Abbreviations

JdI	<i>Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts</i>
JEA	<i>The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
JEN	<i>Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi</i>
JEOL	<i>Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"</i>
<i>Jews in Babylonia</i>	R. Zadok, <i>The Jews in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods according to the Babylonian Sources</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
JTVI	<i>Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute</i>
K.	siglum for tablets, etc., in the British Museum, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities ("Kuyunjik")
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i>
KAV	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts</i>
KB	<i>Keilschriftliche Bibliothek</i>
<i>Keilschrifttexte Sargons</i>	H. Winckler, <i>Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons</i>
<i>Keilschrifttexte Sargon's</i>	D.C. Lyon, <i>Keilschrifttexte Sargon's, Königs von Assyrien</i>
<i>Kish Excavations</i>	P.R.S. Moorey, <i>Kish Excavations 1923-1933, with a Microfiche Catalogue of the Objects in Oxford Excavated by the Oxford-Field Museum, Chicago Expedition to Kish in Iraq, 1923-1933</i>
<i>Kolophone</i>	H. Hunger, <i>Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone</i>
LAS	S. Parpola, <i>Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal</i>
LBAT	A.J. Sachs, ed., <i>Late Babylonian Astronomical and Related Texts Copied by T.C. Pinches and J.N. Strassmaier</i>
LKU	A. Falkenstein, <i>Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Uruk</i>
MAOC	<i>Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft</i>
MDAIK	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo</i>
MDOC	<i>Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin</i>
MDP	<i>Délégation en Perse, Mémoires</i>
MSKH	J.A. Brinkman, <i>Materials and Studies for Kassite History</i>
MSL	<i>Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon/Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon</i>

Abbreviations

MVAC	<i>Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft</i>
NARCD	J.N. Postgate, <i>Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees</i>
NBC	Nies Babylonian Collection (tablet siglum)
Nbk.	J.N. Strassmaier, <i>Inschriften von Nabuchodonosor, König von Babylon</i>
NCBT	Newell Collection of Babylonian Tablets (siglum)
ND	siglum for excavation numbers from the British expedition to Nimrud
NL	Nimrud Letter
<i>North Palace of Ashurbanipal</i>	R.D. Barnett, <i>Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)</i>
NT	siglum (infix) for excavation numbers from the American expedition to Nippur
OIAR	<i>The Oriental Institute Annual Report</i>
OIC	<i>Oriental Institute Communications</i>
OIP	<i>Oriental Institute Publications</i>
Or	<i>Orientalia</i> (nova series)
Or. Ant.	<i>Oriens Antiquus</i>
Palais	P. Carelli, ed., <i>Le palais et la royauté</i>
PBS	<i>Publications of the Babylonian Section</i> (University Museum, University of Pennsylvania)
PEFQS	<i>Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement</i>
PKB	J.A. Brinkman, <i>A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia, 1158-722 B.C.</i>
"Political History"	pp. 3-100 of E. Carter and M. Stolper, <i>Elam: Surveys of Political History and Archaeology</i>
<i>Power and Propaganda</i>	M.T. Larsen, ed., <i>Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires</i>
Prisme	J.-M. Aynard, <i>Le prisme du Louvre</i> AO 19.939
PRT	E.C. Klauber, <i>Politisch-religiöse Texte aus der Sargonidenzeit</i>
PTS	siglum for tablets from the Princeton Theological Seminary collection
R	H.C. Rawlinson, <i>The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia</i>
RA	<i>Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale</i>
RCAE	L. Waterman, <i>Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire</i>
rev.	reverse
RCTC	<i>Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes</i>
RLA	<i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie</i>

Abbreviations

RMA	R. C. Thompson, <i>The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon in the British Museum</i>
RT	<i>Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes</i>
Šamašsumukīn	C.F. Lehmann, <i>Šamašsumukīn, König von Babylonien 668-648 v. Chr.: inschriftliches Material über den Beginn seiner Regierung</i>
SANE	<i>Sources from the Ancient Near East</i>
Sargon	A.G. Lie, <i>The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria, Part I: The Annals</i>
Senn.	S. Smith, <i>The First Campaign of Sennacherib, King of Assyria, B.C. 705-681</i>
Sippar	V. Scheil, <i>Une saison de fouilles à Sippar</i>
SpTU	<i>Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk</i>
Studier Buhl	J. Jacobsen, ed., <i>Studier tilegnede Professor, Dr. Phil. og Theol. Frants Buhl i anledning af hans 75 aars fødselsdag den 6 September 1925</i>
Studies Haupt	C. Adler and A. Ember, eds., <i>Oriental Studies Published in Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary (1883-1923) of Paul Haupt as Director of the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University</i>
Studies Oppenheim	R.D. Biggs and J.A. Brinkman, eds., <i>Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim</i>
Studi Pintore	O. Carruba, M. Liverani, and C. Zaccagnini, eds., <i>Studi orientalistici in ricordo di Franco Pintore</i>
Symbolae van Oven	<i>Symbolae ad ius et historiam antiquitatis pertinentes Julio Christiano van Oven dedicateae</i>
TBER	J.-M. Durand, <i>Textes babyloniens d'époque récente</i>
TCL	<i>Musée du Louvre—Département des Antiquités Orientales, Textes Guneiformes</i>
TGS	<i>Texts from Guneiform Sources</i>
TDP	R. Labat, <i>Traité akkadien de diagnostics et pronostics médicaux</i>
TEBR	F. Joannès, <i>Textes économiques de la Babylonie récente</i>
Tiglat-Pileser	P. Rost, <i>Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileasers III. nach den Papierabklatschen und Originalen Britischen Museums</i>
TSSI	J.C.L. Gibson, <i>Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions</i>
TuM NF	<i>Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection of Babylonian Antiquities im Eigentum der Universität Jena (Neue Folge)</i>

Abbreviations

Uch Tepe	McG. Gibson, ed., <i>Uch Tepe</i> , vol 1. <i>Tell Razuk, Tell Ahmed al-Mughir, Tell Ajamat</i>
UGP	<i>University of California Publications in Semitic Philology</i>
UE	<i>Ur Excavations</i>
UET	<i>Ur Excavations, Texts</i>
UVB	<i>Vorläufiger Bericht über die . . . Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka</i>
VA	(siglum for objects in the collection of the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin)
VAB	<i>Vorderasiatische Bibliothek</i>
VAS	<i>Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin</i>
VAT	(siglum for clay tablets in the collection of the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin)
W.	siglum for excavation numbers from the German expedition to Uruk (Warka)
WO	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
WVDOG	<i>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i>
WZKM	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i>
YBC	siglum for tablets, etc., in the Yale Babylonian Collection
YOS	<i>Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts</i>
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
Zikir šumim	G. van Driel et al., eds., <i>Zikir šumim: Assyriological Studies Presented to F.R. Kraus on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday</i>

INTRODUCTION

In the early sixth century B.C., the Babylonian Empire under Nebuchadnezzar II dominated the Fertile Crescent and the civilized kingdoms of southwest Asia. The ancient capital of Babylon with its monumental temples, palaces, and ziggurat, and its fabled hanging gardens was the largest city in the Near East and served as the hub of a far-flung commercial network connecting the Mediterranean shores with the Persian Gulf and the caravan routes of Arabia with the Iranian plateau and the riches of the East. Financial prosperity not only filled the coffers of large banking firms in Babylon, but encouraged the founding of new towns in the countryside and the revitalization and expansion of old urban centers. Babylonian savants with their venerable traditions of cuneiform learning cultivated the fields of religion, science, and the arts and enhanced the intellectual environment for a cosmopolitan urban population which included deportees from conquered territories—such as Judah—and strangers from Egypt, the lands of the Aegean, and Iran. In the early sixth century, Babylon was the political, cultural, and economic center of the ancient Near East.

How did Babylon come to attain this eminence? Although her intellectual traditions go back well over a thousand years before this time, her political career was checkered and undistinguished; and her economy had faltered for lengthy periods. In the early centuries of the first millennium B.C. (c. 1000-748 B.C.),¹ she reached a nadir in her history. Political power had become fragmented and was shared between a weak central government, semi-independent cities, and vigorous tribes which controlled substantial portions of the hinterland. The older settled

1. Year dates in this monograph are given in terms of the Julian calendar. A year cited simply as "747" stands actually for 747/746, since the Babylonian New Year fell close to the time of the vernal equinox. Month and day dates are cited according to the Babylonian (or Assyrian) calendar, with Roman numerals for months and Arabic numerals for days. Full dates are thus quoted in the form III-4-692, standing for the month Simanu, fourth day, 692 B.C. (corresponding to the first regnal year of Mushezib-Marduk).

In accordance with Babylonian custom, the regnal dates listed for monarchs are considered to begin with their first full year in office and exclude the accession year (save in those cases where the king's reign ended during the accession year); thus Shamash-shum-ukin, whose reign is listed as 687-648, came to the throne sometime in the course of the year 688. A table of contemporary rulers of Babylonia, Elam, and Assyria is given below on pp. 126-127.

For an attempt to calibrate more closely Assyrian and Julian dates between 681 and 648 B.C., see the tables in Parpola, *LAS* 2 382-383.

population had declined significantly in size as well as influence. Long stretches of watercourses, the lifelines of irrigation agriculture, had been abandoned or had fallen into disuse. Recorded economic life had all but ceased, and there is no evidence for significant foreign trade being carried on by the settled population. Because of her political and economic debility, Babylonia's horizons had considerably narrowed; almost all known external contacts during this period were with her immediate neighbors to the north and east—Assyria, Luristan, and Elam. Babylonia was politically weak, economically impoverished, and internationally insignificant.

Then, in the space of six score years between 747 and 626 B.C., the picture totally changed. Babylonia underwent a substantial but gradual transformation from political and economic weakness to reinvigorated national strength on the threshold of territorial expansion. During these decades, the Late Assyrian Empire was the preeminent power in southwest Asia and made its impact felt in Babylonia through conquest and perennial domination. For Babylonia, Assyrian military and political oppression served in effect as a catalyst: it stimulated the people of the land to develop new social institutions, to heal political fragmentation, and to transcend military backwardness. The stabilization of the Babylonian monarchy under Assyrian occupation strengthened the economic environment and prepared the way for the revitalization of urban structures.

It is the purpose of this monograph to chart the career of Babylonia over these crucial decades before its rise to empire and to probe the reasons behind its transformation. We shall begin with a broad discussion of the institutional landscape in which these changes took shape (Part I) and then deal diachronically with the primary historical trends of the period and the events through which these trends manifested themselves (Parts II-VII).² Finally we shall discuss the textual and archeological sources (Part VIII) and conclude with a general summary.

2. Within each of these sections, the general trends of the period will be discussed first and then the specific events arranged either topically or serially.

PART I

Institutional Landscape and General Trends

Recently published archeological surface surveys have provided data for appraising the demographic base of Babylonian society over the longer time span between 1150 and 626 B.C.³ Despite their methodological and practical limitations,⁴ these surveys help to compensate for inadequate contemporary documentation, especially concerning the economy and rural society.⁵ To date detailed surveys have covered less than one-third of the settled area in the alluvium between the southern Tigris and Euphrates,⁶ concentrating principally along the main course or courses of

3. I.e., from about the end of the Kassite dynasty to the beginning of the Neo-Babylonian dynasty under Nabopolassar (the "Middle Babylonian" period of Robert Adams, the "Post-Cassite" period of Henry Wright). We deal with these centuries as a unit here since the archeological surveys have not as yet further refined their periodization. For the general context, see my article in *JNES* 43 (1984) 169-180.

4. Amply sketched by Parr in P. Ucko *et al.*, eds., *Man, Settlement and Urbanism*, pp. 805-810 and by Robert Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, chapter 2. Attempts to estimate the size of the occupied area in the lower levels of a mound from the distribution of pottery on the mound's surface are inevitably hazardous. The chronology of ceramic indices for southern Mesopotamia after 2100 B.C. is poorly understood (particularly for the centuries between 1150 and 626), and further refinements in ceramic dating may be expected to alter the presently accepted patterns and periodization for archeological survey results. Smaller mounds are especially vulnerable to wind damage and today may not be readily perceptible, on larger mounds, thin levels representing sparse occupation are likely to disappear or to be missed by surveyors. For reservations about how accurately gross occupied hectareage reflects actual population levels, see n. 9 below. These and other factors affect the reliability of present survey results for purposes of historical reconstruction.

5. The low level is particularly marked for the years 1155-748, when the average number of dated economic texts was less than 3.5% of what it had been in the preceding four centuries (cf. *PKB*, pp. 6-9, *MSKH* 1 79-328, 446-448; *JCS* 35 [1983] 63; *JNES* 43 [1984] 177). Documentation levels then rose significantly in the late eighth century and continued to increase in the seventh (*JCS* 35 [1983] 8-63, *JNES* 43 [1984] 177).

6. Adams, *Land behind Baghdad* (cf. Jacobsen, *Salinity and Irrigation Agriculture in Antiquity*); Adams and Nissen, *The Uruk Countryside*; Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, including the appendix by Henry Wright. One should also note supplementary work by Gasche and De Meyer in De Meyer, ed., *Tell ed-Dēr* 3 1-13 and plan I; Jacobsen, *Iraq* 22 (1960) 174-185 and

the lower Euphrates as known in the fourth and third millennia B.C.⁷ Thus a comparatively narrow belt (c. 40-70 km wide) around the former Euphrates channels from about 45 km northwest of Nippur down to the vicinity of Ur has been subjected to at least limited survey, as has the southern end of the Diyala basin. For these regions, the coverage seems at present to be reasonably representative.⁸

Statistics for all intensively surveyed regions point to a significant drop in occupation levels—and presumably in population—in the late second and early first millennia B.C. Compared with the preceding period (c. 1600-1150 B.C.), the gross settled area⁹ in each region declined, progressively more severely as one moves from south to north. The extreme proportions vary from the vicinity of Ur, where the settled area was almost 78% as large as it had been in Kassite times, to the lower Diyala basin, where the area was only 23% of its former size. The following table indicates the level of survival in each region:

⁷ Sumer 25 (1969) 103-109; Roux, *Sumer* 16 (1960) 20-31; Cibson, *Uch Tepe* 1 20-24.

The Kish and Akkad surveys (Cibson, *The City and Area of Kish*, including the appendix by Adams) are of little use for our purposes since they did not distinguish a separate period between Kassite and Neo-Babylonian. Furthermore the coverage of the Akkad survey is inadequate by present standards; if one contrasts the region around Sippar as published by Adams (in Cibson, *The City and Area of Kish*, maps 1B-1C) and as mapped by Casche (in De Meyer, ed., *Tell ed-Dēr* 3 plan 1), it can be seen that the latter survey noted more than thirty times the number of sites in the same territory (over 220 sites as opposed to only 7 in the earlier survey). The earlier surveys did not attempt to cover the full range of historical periods.

⁸ These surveys—at least in the Nippur, Uruk, and Ur regions—were done by archeologists for whom a primary research interest was the origins and early development of urbanism in Mesopotamia. Hence they tended to focus in areas where settlement was heaviest in the fourth and third millennia B.C., namely the Nippur-Uruk corridor and its southern extension.

⁹ This assumption is hardly incontestable, since well-established ceramic stratigraphic criteria are at present almost entirely lacking (see the statement by Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 174).

¹⁰ I.e., total hectareage occupied by settlements in each region. This datum provides a basis for calculating the maximum supportable population for a given period (Boserup, *Population and Technological Change*, especially p. 9); when we speak of population levels in this section, it is this maximum figure that is meant. A correlation between supportable and actual population cannot at present be established either archeologically or textually, and this limitation must be kept in mind in the discussion that follows.

Table 1

Regional Variations in Continuance of Gross Settlement Levels in Southern Mesopotamia, 1600-626 B.C.¹⁰

	A. Gross Hectareage of Settlements, 1600-1150	B. Gross Hectareage of Settlements, 1150-626	C. Column B as Percentage of Column A
Lower Diyala	230	53	23.0%
Nippur	1004	417	41.5%
Uruk	272	175	64.3%
Ur	179	139	77.7%

¹⁰ These data have been derived from Adams, *Land behind Baghdad*, pp. 53-56 tables 14-15; Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, pp. 172-173 table 14 (with corrections noted below); Wright in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, pp. 332-333. Since the Nippur and Uruk surveys as conducted did not in themselves systematically divide the territory south of Kisurra and north of Imam Sayyid Shoka (= site 1635 on the base map in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*) between the two regions (i.e., Nippur and vicinity and Uruk and vicinity), I have drawn an arbitrary east-west dividing line just south of Zabalam, about midway between Nippur and Uruk. For purposes of the present calculations, this puts Uruk, Larsa, and sites 043, 046-047, 050-165, 172-466, 1473-1500, 1502-1503, 1505-1507, and 1511-1639 into the Uruk region and the rest into the Nippur area. It should be stressed that this is not an attempt to delimit the hinterland of the two cities, but simply an effort to make an arbitrary division for illustrating regional variation in the northern and southern portions of the larger surveyed zone. Future researches will undoubtedly divide the respective areas in a manner that will do fuller justice to the topography and to the complete range of periods.

With respect to the Nippur-Uruk surveys, it will be observed that the data as given in various sections of Adams, *Heartland of Cities* (pp. 138-139 table 12 and figure 25, p. 142 table 13, pp. 167 and 169 figures 34-35, and pp. 172-173 table 14) are not always consistent. To calculate the figures for Table 1 here, I have used Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, pp. 172-173 table 14 as the base with the following necessary adjustments: (a) site 001 must be deleted (it is identical with site 1464 [*ibid.*, p. 286]); (b) site 039 was not occupied in Kassite times, but abandoned after the Old Babylonian period (Adams and Nissen, *The Uruk Countryside*, p. 221); (c) site 247 belongs in the 10.1-20.0 hectare size in both the Kassite and Middle Babylonian columns; (d) site 253 belongs in the 20.1-40.0 hectare category in both Kassite and Middle Babylonian times; (e) site 1389 belongs in the 10.1-20.0 hectare category in the Middle Babylonian column; (f) Isin belongs in the 40.1-200.0 hectare category in Middle Babylonian times. (These corrections have been confirmed privately by Robert Adams.) The totals reached here thus vary slightly from those in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 142 table 13.

Though we are not as yet in a position to make due allowance for possible diachronic shifts in population-density ratios,¹¹ the raw figures suggest that relative losses in population in the early stages of the 1150-626 period may have ranged from about one person in four in the far south (Ur) to about three persons in four in the northeast (lower Diyala). It must be stressed that these ebbs in population size are not to be viewed as a unique sharp decline brought on by catastrophic events, but rather as the culmination of a secular trend toward lower population levels which had begun in most areas of southern Mesopotamia after the Ur III period (c. 2000 B.C.) and reached its nadir at this time.¹²

Also typical of this epoch is a further decline in urbanism: proportionately more people were living in small towns or villages, i.e., settlements that were ten hectares or less in area. This too is part of a long-term trend—in most areas going back to the later Early Dynastic periods (2700-2350 B.C.)—whereby the percentage of the population concentrated in small settlements gradually increased. Here too regional variations may be noted:

Table 2
Percentage of Settled Surface Area Occupied
by Settlements of 10 Hectares or Less, 2700-626 B.C.¹³

	Lower Diyala	Nippur-Uruk
Early Dynastic II-III (2700-2350) ¹⁴	52.9	9.9
Akkadian (2350-2100)	57.8	18.4
Ur III-Larsa (2100-1800)	61.9	25.1
Old Babylonian (1800-1600)	74.5	29.6
Kassite (1600-1150)	81.5	56.8
Post-Kassite (1150-626)	100.0 ¹⁵	64.3

11. There is no indication that the number of persons per settlement hectare remained constant through the various periods.

12. This long-term trend is discussed in *JNES* 43 (1984) 173.

13. Sources of data: Adams, *Land behind Baghdad*, pp. 39-56 tables 10-15; Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 142 table 13 (cf. *ibid.*, p. 138 table 12). It will eventually be advisable: (a) to separate the Nippur and Uruk areas here (as done for Table 1 above) to see whether the trends hold good in both these regions (the vicinity of Uruk was less urbanized than the Nippur region); and (b) to use *Heartland of Cities*, pp. 172-173 table 14 as the data base (with a full set of corrections for all periods comparable to the partial adjustments presented in n. 10 above).

14. The lower Diyala figure is for Early Dynastic I-III, the Nippur-Uruk figure for Early Dynastic II-III.

15. As emended in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 179 table 16 (81.1% in Adams, *Land behind Baghdad*, p. 56 table 15).

Thus both the lower Diyala and the Nippur-Uruk regions, though starting from substantively different patterns of urbanism or hierarchical settlement distribution,¹⁶ gradually became more village-oriented. In contrast, the area around Ur, according to Henry Wright's survey, stood out sharply: after 2900 B.C., the distribution of smaller settlements (here 9.5 hectares or less) fluctuated in no regular pattern between 40% and 49% of the total settled area, reaching a maximum in Old Babylonian times and a minimum under the Kassite dynasty.¹⁷ Thus the tendency for a growing percentage of the population to live in small settlements was pronounced, but not universal. This ruralization movement reached its apogee in the early first millennium, but was clearly being reversed by 600 B.C., except in the Diyala.¹⁸

Also of interest in the early first millennium B.C. are the geographical patterns of abandonment, continuity, and new settlement within each region. In the lower Diyala basin, the only extended watercourse that definitely remained in use in this period was on the far east edge of the surveyed zone;¹⁹ moreover, only 5.7% of the settled area was occupied by new settlements—the abnormally low percentage presumably reflecting the inability or unwillingness of the population to assume new risks in the sparsely settled countryside.²⁰ Along the Nippur-Uruk axis, there was extensive abandonment on the east side of the surveyed region and in the

16. More than half the Early Dynastic population of the lower Diyala was concentrated in villages and small towns, whereas less than one person in ten near Early Dynastic Nippur lived in comparable settlements.

17. These figures are derived in part from the histogram in Wright's appendix to Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 336 figure 25 and in part from the gross settled hectareage figures given *ibid.*, pp. 327-334. The resulting tabulations are not entirely consistent (because of minor inconsistencies in the presentation of the original data), but the maximum calculated range falls between 40.2% and 49.0%.

18. Where the reversal began only in Seleucid times (Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 179 table 16).

19. This was probably the easternmost spur of the middle course of the Taban (see Nashef, *Bagh. Mitt.* 13 [1982] 117-141, especially the map on p. 137; Adams, *Land behind Baghdad*, fig. 3; cf. Jacobsen, *Salinity and Irrigation Agriculture in Antiquity*, p. 76). There is also a line of chronologically indeterminate settlements farther west, but there the attestation in each case is problematic. Note also the low level of contemporary settlement farther north along the Diyala in the Hamrin region (Gibson, *Uch Tepe* 1 23).

20. Out of 53 hectares (total settlement), only three represented new foundations in this period (Adams, *Land behind Baghdad*, p. 56 table 15).

central area between Ishan al-Howa on the north and Qal'a Dulu' on the south.²¹ Only the western section of the Uruk area south of Qal'a Dulu' had a significant percentage of stable, continuing communities.²² It is striking that in the Nippur-Uruk region there were no new settlements south of Isin and Adab and only about 18% of the gross settled hectareage in the northern sector represented fresh settlement.²³ In the southernmost region around Ur, abandonment was particularly pronounced in the northern zone: the former Ur channel of the Euphrates was reduced to a small canal supporting only a few villages plus Ur itself. But in the Ur survey region as a whole more than half the settlements were new, and these represented about 22% of the total settled area. It is difficult to estimate how much of this overall relocation may have been due primarily to hydrological factors—such as the drying up or shifting of watercourses—and how much due to political disruption. But the decline in the western part of the lower Diyala basin and in the eastern section of the Nippur-Uruk region occurred where one would expect pressures from newly arrived Aramean tribesmen to have been greatest; and one could make a similar case for Chaldean-Aramean stress (especially from the Bit-Yakin and Puqudu tribes) in the northern Ur area. The rise in small undefended settlements on the southernmost fringe of the Ur region could indicate sedentary linkage with neighboring Arab tribes who were moving through the area.²⁴ The low proportion of investment in new settlements was probably dependent on several factors, including reduced population size and unreliable defense mechanisms in times of political unrest.

Thus from the surface surveys one gains a general picture of population decline, dispersal into smaller settlements, and relocation out of vulnerable areas. From the jejune textual evidence, especially for the period from 1100 to 750 B.C., one can detect complementary background hints of

21. Sites 1406 and 098 respectively on the base map in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*.

22. Especially those clustered within the triangle whose points are sites 1574, 1612, and 247 on the base map in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*.

23. The southernmost new settlements are sites 1321 (Tell Abu Wadiya) and 1429. In sharp contrast to the Nippur and Ur areas, no new settlements were detected in the Uruk region (as defined in n. 10 above); but here this represented a marked shift from the immediately preceding period: in Kassite times new settlements had comprised more than 60% of the gross occupied hectareage around Uruk.

By "northern sector" in the text above is meant Nippur and vicinity as defined in n. 10.

24. Compare the data presented by Wright in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 333; UET 4 167; Brinkman, *Or* 34 (1965) 258, Eph'al, *JAOS* 94 (1974) 108-115.

climatic irregularity, crop failure, outbreaks of plague,²⁵ and disruptive tribal population movements. But there remain questions about whether the broad picture of decline applies with equal validity to all of Babylonia and for all of the time span between 1150 and 626 B.C. Although generally unnoticed, there is evidence which indicates: (1) by the early first millennium B.C. the intensively surveyed regions may no longer have been typical for Babylonia as a whole, and (2) the general decline in Babylonia may have been substantially arrested before 720 B.C., rather than a century later. The detailed surveys did not touch several crucial areas where major economic and political activity is documented in the eighth and seventh centuries, particularly the northwest section of the alluvium (where urban centers were concentrated)²⁶ and the principal tribal homelands of the Chaldeans in the west²⁷ and southeast.²⁸ According to the longer accounts of Sennacherib's first campaign, these tribal areas held a large number of cities and fortified settlements.²⁹ Also, in the early first millennium B.C., two additional factors must be taken into account: (1) the major Euphrates courses had by then shifted considerably to the west of the old Nippur-Uruk axis—and so outside the area covered by the intensive surveys—and thus the principal band of contemporaneous Euphrates-based settlements would be expected to lie to the west of the surveyed zone;³⁰ and (2) much of the Nippur-Uruk hinterland would have been controlled by Aramean tribal groups at a comparatively low level of urbanism, i.e., groups whose impermanent quarters would not leave traces that are readily identifiable

25. The role of famine and pestilence in the historical decline of these centuries has probably been underestimated (cf. PKB, p. 389 n. 2180). One should note also the incidence of plague recorded in the eponym chronicles from eighth-century Assyria (RLA 2 430 and 432; cf. the Babylonian Chronicle ii 5', text in TCS 5 76).

26. Notably Sippar, Babylon, Borsippa, and Dilbat. Parts of the hinterland of this region were covered by the old Akkad survey, which is deficient by present standards (see n. 6 above).

27. Especially the area of Bit-Dakkuri, along the Euphrates for a considerable stretch south of Borsippa.

28. Bit-Yakin, which included extensive marshlands to the southeast of the Nippur-Uruk survey. For the topography of the area, see Roux, *Sumer* 16 (1960) 20-31 and Wright's appendix in Adams, *Heartland of Cities* (easternmost sector of the Ur survey region).

29. OIP 2 52-54.

30. One factor behind the relative lack of settlement decline in the Ur region at this time may have been that the significant westward shift of the southbound course of the Euphrates would not have had so severe an impact on the Ur-Eridu area (where the Euphrates flow was essentially from west to east) as it had at Nippur or even at Uruk.

by traditional surface reconnaissance techniques. Thus the major scene of action in lower Mesopotamia from at least the middle of the ninth century³¹ would not be expected to lie in the former urban "heartland," but outside the intensively surveyed areas, especially to the northwest, west, and southeast.³² In addition, the substantial documentation—administrative, legal, and epistolary—that commences about 747 and increases significantly after 722 suggests by both its quantity and contents that the depths of the prior dark age were over in the third quarter of the eighth century.³³ Thus, while the broad picture of population decline may be generally valid for central lower Mesopotamia in the early first millennium B.C., there is evidence indicating that:

- (1) the period of worst decline ended in the second half of the eighth century rather than one hundred years later;
- (2) a primary focus of urban activity after the mid-ninth century lay outside the intensively surveyed regions, i.e., to the northwest of the Nippur-Uruk corridor; and
- (3) the major tribal areas—including fortifications and towns—lay along the unsurveyed banks of the contemporary Euphrates to the west of Nippur and Uruk and in the marshy territories to the east of Uruk and Ur.³⁴

Therefore the general picture of population decline should be modified to reflect local variations as well as adjustments in periodization.³⁵

31. And perhaps from the mid-twelfth century on.

32. This is treated in more detail in my article in *JNES* 43 (1984) 176.

33. That this view does not reflect only modern statistics of document survival may be seen from a Hellenistic tradition attributed to Berossos (*FGH* 680 F 16) which placed the end of the dark age just before the reign of Nabonassar (747-734); cf. *PKB*, p. 227 and *JNES* 43 (1984) 177 (for documentation statistics).

34. Note also the qualifying statements by Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, pp. 152-154 and the reservations by Gibson, *OIA* 1981-82, p. 40.

35. We must also reckon with the possibility that in some regions population shift (from place to place or from a settled to a relatively mobile way of life) may have been equally or even more significant than population decline. One of the fundamental problems of the archaeological surface survey is that, within each of its large periods, it is unable at present to distinguish concurrent from consecutive settlement; therefore all sites occupied at any point in a long period are treated loosely as synchronic. Thus what is recorded from each period is maximum extent of settlement without chronological articulation, and the survey cannot detect wholesale shifts of village populations from one site to another or phenomena such as the *Wüstungen* in rural Germany in the late Middle Ages.

For the late eighth and seventh centuries, written sources supplement and add depth to the rough demographic portrait drawn from archaeological surveys. Contemporary letters and economic records, as well as the campaign narratives of Assyrian royal inscriptions, help to fill in details about the population of the towns and countryside of Babylonia. The inhabitants of Babylonia in the late eighth century were composed of two principal groups: the older "Babylonian" native stock (an amalgam of descendants of the Sumerians and Akkadians and such assimilated later immigrants as the Amorites and Kassites) and relatively recently arrived tribesmen, such as Arameans and Chaldeans, who were as yet unassimilated. By 750 B.C., the constituent elements of the older population had lost their political and ethnic identity and shared a common Babylonian culture. This group formed the majority of the population in the urban centers in the northwest alluvium³⁶ and in the southwest.³⁷ Because of the urban focus of the extant documentation, we do not yet know whether significant numbers of this population group resided in the countryside, for instance in northern Babylonia. The dominant social unit among the older Babylonians was the family (nuclear or extended), although under the hectic political conditions of the seventh century smaller family units in the cities increasingly came to align themselves into broader kin-based groups that traced descent from common eponymous ancestors or bore distinctive family names.³⁸ The most important larger kin-groups eventually came to dominate the civil and religious hierarchy in several towns, particularly in northern Babylonia.³⁹

36. Particularly at Sippar, Babylon, Borsippa, Dilbat, and Nippur.

37. Especially at Uruk and Ur.

38. Family names were often derived from an occupation, such as Potter, Smith, Fisher, Priest-of-Sippar, or the like. They were cited usually as the third generation in an ascendant genealogy, e.g., "Marduk-nadin-shumi, son of (A/DUMU-*šū šū*) Nabu-balassu-iqbi, son of (A/DUMU) the Potter." In such cases, the first two names stand for the prime referent and his father; the third name is the ancestral or family name. The use of three names—rather than two—gradually became more common in Babylonia during the second half of the seventh century. The evolution of larger kin-based units at a time when the settled population was under political pressure from both local tribesmen and Assyria is to some extent analogous with the development of tribal organization under circumstances of contact with politically more advanced peoples as sketched by M. H. Fried, *The Notion of Tribe* (Menlo Park, California: Cummings, 1975).

39. Brinkman in M. T. Larsen, ed., *Power and Propaganda*, pp. 237-238 (with notes on geographical distribution). The phenomenon at Borsippa in the late eighth and seventh centuries has now been studied by G. Frame, "The 'First Families' of Borsippa during the Early Neo-Babylonian Period," *JCS* 36 (1984) 67-80.

The tribesmen, who are distinguished primarily by their social structure,⁴⁰ controlled substantial portions of the countryside. There were two major tribal groups, the Arameans and the Chaldeans,⁴¹ both of West Semitic origin.⁴² It should be stressed that the dichotomy between the diverse populations in Babylonia was not based on place or type of residence (urban vs. rural, sedentary vs. non-sedentary), but on social or sociopolitical organization (tribal vs. non-tribal). Many tribesmen lived in towns, and some even in large urban centers.⁴³

The Arameans had been in Babylonia longer than the Chaldeans, but were on the whole more fragmented and less sedentary.⁴⁴ Arameans had begun arriving in lower Mesopotamia in large numbers at the beginning of the eleventh century⁴⁵ and had settled principally across the northern end of the alluvium, around Nippur, and on both sides of the lower Tigris.⁴⁶

40. This may be seen especially in textual references to their individual genealogies or ethnic identifications (in contrast to the older Babylonian practice of citing a two- or three-tier genealogy focused on membership in an extended or nuclear family); this is explained more fully on pp. 13-15 below. Structural analysis is complicated by the fact that Aramean and Chaldean tribes served as both social and political units. The concepts of "tribe" and "clan" as applied to the ancient world are in need of more systematic study; note the remarks of Fred M. Donner, *The Early Islamic Conquests* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 283-284 n. 24, which are also applicable for the most part to earlier periods in Iraq.

41. For Arabs in Babylonia, see pp. 27-28 below. There were also groups referred to as "Sutians," a term which in this period may have been primarily a designation for nomadic or semi-nomadic groups on the fringes of civilization ("tent-dwellers") rather than a specific ethnic or ethno-linguistic classification. For preliminary observations on the Sutians in Babylonia in the early first millennium, see PKB, pp. 285-287 and Heltzer, *The Suteans*, pp. 93-97.

42. I.e., their basic linguistic affiliation lay with Semitic groups outside the East Semitic (Assyro-Babylonian) language family.

43. Towns: e.g., Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 44, 58-60; *OIP* 2 52-54; unfortunately there is little indication of the size of these settlements. Large urban centers: e.g., *OIP* 2 54:52. One wonders about the effect of town or urban life on the cohesiveness of tribal bonds.

44. On the Arameans in Babylonia, see in general: M. Streck, "Die nomadischen Völkerschaften Babyloniens und des angrenzenden Elams," *MVAG* 11 (1906) 203-246; S. Schiffer, *Die Aramäer: Historisch-geographische Untersuchungen*; B. Moritz, "Die Nationalität der Aramu-Stämme in Südost-Babylonien," in C. Adler and A. Ember, eds., *Studies Haupt*, pp. 184-211; Brinkman, PKB, pp. 267-285; M. Dietrich, *AOAT* 7 (with the reservations noted in *Or* 46 [1977] 304-325).

45. Earlier contacts with Arameans under the name *Ahlamû* date back to at least the fourteenth century B.C.

46. In broad terms (and with obvious exceptions), the Arameans were settled principally along the Tigris and its tributaries, whereas the Chaldeans were grouped primarily along the

There were more than forty Aramean tribes, some of which were under the simultaneous leadership of as many as eight sheikhs (*nasiku*).⁴⁷ The most prominent of these tribes in the late eighth and seventh centuries were: (1) the Gamhulu, living in a marshy region (perhaps centered around modern Wasit) near the Elamite border;⁴⁸ (2) the Puqudu, active both along the Babylonian-Elamite frontier and in the vicinity of Uruk in southwestern Babylonia;⁴⁹ and (3) the Ru'ua near Nippur.⁵⁰ The Arameans had generally resisted assimilation to Babylonian ways; they had retained their distinctive personal names and tribal structure and had not taken an active role in the Babylonian political system.⁵¹ Individual Arameans were usually identified in texts not by a Babylonian two-tier genealogy (e.g., "Nadinu son of Zakir-shumi"), but simply by their own personal name plus a gentilic adjective referring to their tribe—i.e., "Samgunu, the Gambulian" (*Samgunu Gambûlayu*). The Arameans had few large towns,⁵² and their economy was primarily pastoral. Their principal impact

Euphrates. For the places of Aramean settlement, see PKB, pp. 269-270; Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 44-52; *OIP* 2 49, 54, etc. Note the occurrence of Arameans in witness lists of legal texts from Nippur: "Na-NE-ru LÜ ru-û-a-a" (NBC 6142:13, dated V-29-664 B.C.) and possibly "Ia-a-da-a" father of *Nabû-nâdin-abi* (NBC 6143:7, dated VIII-2-634). Aramean groups were also in the vicinity of Uruk and Ur, to judge from descriptions in the Assyrian royal correspondence (cf. *BIN* 2 132).

47. *Power and Propaganda*, p. 226 (with documentation); Lie, *Sargon*, p. 45 n. 9. The reading of the damaged passage in CT 53 75 rev. 11 (translated as "eighty sheikhs" in *LAS* 1 no. 284) is not certain and in any case need hardly allude to the leaders of a single tribe; Walker has kindly collated the line and in a letter of 17 February 1984 states "it is definitely not 80" (though the actual reading remains problematic).

48. Streck, *MVAG* 11 (1906) 218-223; *idem*, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2 (new edition; Leiden: Brill, 1965), p. 357 s.v. "Djabbul"; cf. de Goeje, *ZDMG* 39 (1885) 8, and Parpola, *AOAT* 6 128-129.

49. Babylonian and Assyrian *Puqudu* (less commonly *Piqûdu*); biblical Peqod (Jeremiah 50:21, Ezekiel 23:23). Streck, *MVAG* 11 (1906) 234-237; Parpola, *AOAT* 6 280-281. In the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon II, and Sennacherib, the Puqudu are attested primarily along Babylonia's eastern border (e.g., Rost, *Tiglath-Pileser*, p. 56; Lie, *Sargon*, p. 48; *OIP* 2 49), but they were active also around Uruk and Bit-Amukani particularly in the seventh century (*ABL* 267, 268, 275, 751, 896 and *passim*; cf. *BIN* 2 132).

50. Streck, *MVAG* 11 (1906) 240; Parpola, *AOAT* 6 295.

51. The theory that an eleventh-century king of Babylonia (Adad-apla-iddina) was an Aramean has now been shown to be based on a textual misinterpretation: C. B. F. Walker in G. van Driel *et al.*, eds., *Zikir šumim*, p. 414.

52. Most of such towns were connected with the Gambulu and located in eastern Babylonia. Another indication of less sedentary settlement patterns for the Arameans may be

on Babylonia seems to have been in the realm of language, where in this period Aramaic was fast replacing Babylonian as the vernacular; by the late eighth century, the use of Aramaic in Babylonia may have become so widespread that officials had to be dissuaded from using it in government correspondence.⁵³ It is unfortunate that we are not better informed about the Arameans in Babylonia and Assyria at this time because the extensive language changes may already have been symptomatic of an incipient Aramaization of Mesopotamian culture;⁵⁴ at maturity, this trend would impart a distinctive character to Mesopotamian civilization, especially in the centuries between the demise of independent Babylonia (539 B.C.) and the coming of Islam (c. A.D. 637).

The Chaldeans, although later arrivals,⁵⁵ were both more sedentary and more unified than the Arameans. There were three major and two minor Chaldean tribes, each named the "House of So-and-so" (after an eponymous ancestor) and each under the control of a single chieftain.⁵⁶

that in contemporary documentary evidence camels are more often mentioned in conjunction with their tribes than with Chaldeans.

53. CT 54 10; Dietrich, *WO* 4 (1967-68) 90; Parpola, *ARIN*, pp. 123-124 n. 9. One should note other signs of the use of Aramaic: Aramaic words were borrowed into the Neo-Babylonian dialect (von Soden, *Or* 35 [1966] 1-20; *Or* 37 [1968] 261-271; *Or* 46 [1977] 183-197); an Aramaic scribe (LÚ *si-pi-ri*) occurs as a witness to a legal document in 677 B.C. (Strassmaier, *Huitième Congrès*, no. 3:7; the text is Babylonian and involves Babylonian principals, but was written in Assur: *al libbi ali*); Aramaic dockets begin to appear in Babylonia in the mid-seventh century if not earlier (BRM 1 22 must be considered uncertain because of the anomalous form of the royal name; but see *JCS* 35 [1983] 32 [K. 99] and 23 [J. 20]); a report from Babylonia c. 650 B.C. was written in Aramaic (KAI no. 233; Gibson, *TSSI* 2 20). On Babylonian-Aramean cultural impact, see Greenfield in Nissen and Renger, eds., *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn*, pp. 471-482. It has been debated whether Assyrian reliefs depicting two scribes working on different kinds of writing material show records being written in cuneiform and Aramaic or battlefield impressions being jotted down by a scribe and a relief artist (Madhlom, *The Chronology of Neo-Assyrian Art*, pp. 121-122; see also Tadmor in H. Nissen and J. Renger, eds., *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn*, p. 452). According to Zadok, Aramaic influence on toponyms in Babylonia may have been negligible through much of the first millennium B.C. (*WO* 12 [1981] 39-69). In Assyria, Aramaic seems to have replaced Assyrian as the vernacular at an even more rapid rate, perhaps because of the numerous deportees from the West settled in or near the major cities.

54. Note the later tradition that Ahiqar, an Aramean, served as *ummānu* under Esarhaddon (*UVB* 18 45 and pl. 27-19-20; cf. *JAOS* 103 [1983] 37 n. 16 and the Elephantine material cited by Greenfield, *JAOS* 82 [1962] 292-293).

55. They are first attested in Babylonia about the year 878 B.C. (*PKB*, p. 260).

56. Chiefs of Chaldean tribes were sometimes so powerful that they were styled "kings" in Assyrian royal inscriptions, e.g., *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 12; Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 52 Episode 12.

The major tribes were: (a) Bit-Amukani, on the lower Euphrates above Uruk; (h) Bit-Dakkuri, on the central Euphrates south of Borsippa but occasionally active around Babylon itself;⁵⁷ and (c) Bit-Yakin, the most powerful of the Chaldean tribes, dominating the land around Ur and the marshes to the east (the "Sealand").⁵⁸ Of lesser importance were the Bit-Sha'ali and the Bit-Shilani, smaller tribes that are mentioned only infrequently in the sources.⁵⁹ By the late eighth century, the Chaldeans—although preserving their basic tribal structure—were becoming Babylonized: many of them bore Babylonian names, were settled in fortified towns and villages, and were engaged in cultivating date palms and raising cattle. Individual Chaldeans cited their genealogy in most cases simply by calling themselves "son" of their tribe's eponymous ancestor (thus: Ea-zera-iqisha "son" of Amukanu).⁶⁰ Because they controlled most of the course of the Euphrates through Babylonia as well as the marshes at the head of the Persian Gulf, the Chaldeans were in a position to regulate a substantial portion of international and domestic trade. Beginning in the early eighth century, they also entered actively into Babylonian political life; and before the year 730, each of the three principal Chaldean tribes had in turn furnished at least one occupant of the Babylonian throne.⁶¹

57. This included the town of Marad (*OIP* 2 52).

58. This included Larsa, Eridu, and Kissik (*OIP* 2 53). For the general area in which Bit-Yakin is located, see Roux, *Sumer* 16 (1960) 20-31. The best discussion of the geography of the Chaldean lands in Babylonia is still that of Sidney Smith, *Senn.*, pp. 19-25.

59. It is possible that the early devastation and deportation of both these tribes by Tiglath-pileser III may have been a factor in their later lack of prominence. Bit-Adini (not to be confused with the Aramean tribe of the same name in northwestern Mesopotamia) seems to have been a clan of the Bit-Dakkuri rather than an independent tribe. Note too the ephemeral prominence of Larak and its leader in the time of Tiglath-pileser III (Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, p. 60:26, pl. XXXIV 18 [=ARAB 2 §§ 793 and 806, respectively]; cf. NL 2 rev. 9' (LÚ UD.UD 'AG KI' a-a), NL 5:21' in *Iraq* 17 [1955] 27, 33).

60. By way of exception, politically prominent Chaldeans—especially of Merodach-baladan's family—sometimes have their actual father or grandfather named instead of the more customary "son of Yakin." One should also note among the Chaldeans traces of a distinctive ancestor cult as evidenced in their reverence for the bones of their forebears: *OIP* 2 85 (cf. *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 27 n. 153); M. Bayliss, *Iraq* 35 (1973) 124 n. 69; Malbran-Labat in J. Silva Castillo, ed., *Nomads and Sedentary Peoples*, p. 75. Compare the tomb inscription of Shamash-ibni, the chieftain of Bit-Dakkuri in 678 whose body was returned to his homeland by Ashur-etel-ilani: YOS 1 43 (= ARAB 2 §§ 1132-1135), YOS 9 81-82.

61. Eriba-Marduk c. 765 (Bit-Yakin), Nabu-shuma-ishkun c. 760-748 (Bit-Dakkuri), Mukin-zeri 731-729 (Bit-Amukani). General literature on the Chaldeans: *PKB*, pp. 260-267 (with reference to earlier treatments); Edzard, *RLA* 5 291-297.

The king of Babylon presided over this heterogeneous population,⁶² though his power was in effect limited by independent actions of both the larger cities and the tribes.⁶³ Some of the weaker kings were unable to police dissident elements, and uncontrolled civil unrest and disruption of trade routes are probably what attracted the initial Assyrian military intervention in Babylonia in 745 B.C. Following the political collapse of Babylonia at the end of the ninth century, the hereditary principle for monarchical succession had been undermined in practice: there is only one known instance of Babylonian father-son succession between 810 and the rise of the Neo-Babylonian empire in 626.⁶⁴ The monarchy was further destabilized by a rapid turnover in rulers, especially in the years from 733 to 689 (when there were no less than 14 reigns averaging just 3.2 years each).⁶⁵ Although weakened, the Babylonian monarchy perdured as an institution and served as a focus of contention in the late eighth and seventh centuries, when Chaldeans and Assyrians vied with one another to ensure succession of their own candidates to the throne.⁶⁶

Local government in Babylonia was administered through a province (*pihātu*) system, with most major cities and many minor towns serving as

62. Babylonia by the middle of the eighth century seems almost to have become a loose territorial agglomeration of its competing sociopolitical groups. It is surely significant that in this period—and indeed from the time of the Kassite dynasty down through the reign of Nabonidus—there was no single native term to express “Babylonia” as a unit. Expressions for parts of the land such as Akkad, Sumer, the Sealand, and Chaldea were in use; and the royal titulary most commonly employed—other than by Assyrian kings—had as its principal referent the capital city: “King of Babylon.”

For introductory observations on the titulary of the Babylonian kings of this period, see PKB, pp. 167-168; Shea, *AUSS* 9 (1971) 53-65, 99-100; Brinkman in Carelli, ed., *Palais*, pp. 412-413 n. 25. Note that the writing LUGAL E.KI is now attested as early as 718 B.C. (*FB* 12 [1970] 51 no. 1:7).

63. The historical background for this state of affairs is discussed briefly by Brinkman, *CAH* 3/1, 2nd ed., pp. 288-291 and in *Power and Propaganda*, pp. 225-228.

64. When Nabu-nadin-zeri (Nadinu) succeeded Nabonassar in 734, not too long after early Assyrian military intervention in Babylonia. Note that this statistic concerns only native inhabitants of southern Mesopotamia and excludes father-son succession within the Assyrian royal family while Assyrians were occupying the Babylonian throne.

65. This can be broken down into a more stable segment (728-705, with four rulers averaging 6.0 years each) flanked by two periods of accelerated turnover (733-729 and 704-689, with averages of 1.7 years and 2.3 years per monarch respectively).

66. For studies of the Babylonian royal titulary in the eighth and seventh centuries, see n. 62 above. Discussion of the powers and duties of the king: PKB, pp. 289-296; *Palais*, pp. 409-415; *CAH* 3/1, 2nd ed., p. 290.

capitals of their own small provinces. The far southeastern section of the country, which had extensive marshes and no large cities, was treated as a separate larger province under its old name the “Sealand.” Most provinces were under the jurisdiction of a royally appointed governor, the *šakin tēmi* (an older title which had taken on an elevated function about the middle of the ninth century);⁶⁷ a few provinces, such as Nippur and the Sealand, had governors who bore traditional titles, such as *šandabakku* (Nippur) and *šaknu* (Sealand).⁶⁸ Occasionally local rulers with dynastic pretensions affected a more ambitious titulary; thus various members of the Ningaliddin family, which held the governorship at Ur between 680 and 648, styled themselves *šaknu* or even *šakkanakku*.⁶⁹

The Babylonian city remained a strong political and cultural institution. The historical picture is undoubtedly skewed by the urban origin of most surviving documentation, but the elitist bias of the sources is not unrepresentative: cities dominated the economic and intellectual life of the country. Retaining an aura of tradition that in some instances dated back to the golden era of city-states in preceding millennia, the city was still a provincial seat of government and had an assembly of citizens which functioned as a law court in trying contested cases.⁷⁰ Temples in the large cities remained powerful institutions with their splendid liturgical ceremonies, prestigious officials, lucrative prehends,⁷¹ and extensive properties. Citizens in major cult cities especially in the northwest alluvium held privileges of exemption from taxes, corvée, and army service.⁷²

67. PKB, pp. 307-308.

68. The reading of these titles is not altogether certain. Although *šandabakku* has been generally accepted as the Babylonian reading for GÜ.EN.NA following Landsberger, *Bischof*, pp. 75-76, the lexical evidence is far from clear (see most recently Civil, *MSL* 1297). The title *šaknu* was originally *šakin māti*.

69. *šaknu* was an older title for governor and originally represented a higher rank than *šakin tēmi* (see PKB, pp. 297-298); the governor of Kish in the time of Merodach-baladan II was also a *šaknu* (written LÜ GAR-*nu* in Ashmolean 1929.136-4, edited in Walker, *CBI* no. 75, collated). Note also the *šakkanakku* (GIR.NITA) of KUR UG.UD.‘KI’, a high official in the vicinity of Uruk in 743 B.C. (*WO* 5/1 [1969] 40:20). For the Ur titulary, see *Or* 34 (1965) 246 n. 3.

70. See provisionally San Nicolò, *BR* 8/7, pp. 146-147, though there is now much more unpublished material available on these assemblies.

71. I.e., *isqu*. But note the well-founded reservations of L.T. Doty on the use of the term “prebend” (“Cuneiform Archives from Hellenistic Uruk” [unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1977], pp. 119-137).

72. Particularly in Sippar, Nippur, Babylon, and Borsippa; see Brinkman in Carelli, ed., *Palais*, p. 415 and *CAH* 3/1, 2nd ed., p. 291. The relevant texts were edited most recently by

Urban centers such as Nippur and Babylon were distinguished for their pluralist, cosmopolitan society, which included foreigners as well as tribal residents.⁷³ Cities were not only the home of intellectuals and scribal schools, but contained a broad spectrum of classes from merchants and temple officials to settled agriculturalists and pastoralists. The line between town and country population was not so sharply drawn as in some modern Western societies. Cities drew their economic support from a range of sources: temple endowments, private landed property, international and domestic trade, the skilled crafts, and the agricultural and stock-raising activities of the hinterland. Despite the demographic trend toward ruralization in the early first millennium, urbanism remained the norm: successful or prosperous tribes built cities and towns and fortified them with walls.⁷⁴ Because of their wealth and prestige, cities were obvious targets for Assyrian aggression; yet they were not always as vulnerable as one might expect in a non-militaristic society. The walled cities of the northwest alluvium proved formidable obstacles to the Assyrians in the time of the Great Rebellion (652-648), and Babylon twice required lengthy Assyrian sieges to reduce it to submission.⁷⁵ It is surely significant that the most ambitious building program in Babylonia during this period was carried out by a city governor (Sin-balassu-iqbi of Ur)⁷⁶ rather than by a king; and another city governor dated by his own regnal years.⁷⁷ Cities were the focus of local government, society, and economy and remained critical factors in the political and cultural life of the land.

Lambert, *BWL*, pp. 112-115 and Civil, *Diakonoff Fs.*, pp. 324-326. Note also the right of Babylonian citizens to appeal directly to the king (Postgate in Garelli, ed., *Palais*, pp. 417-426).

73. E.g., "there are many foreign peoples (*lišānāti ma'dāti*) in Nippur under the protection of the king my lord" (*ABL* 238 rev. 6-7); *OIP* 254. The presence of ethnic minorities in eighth- and seventh-century Babylonia still needs to be studied systematically; for people of Egyptian descent, see Eph'al, *Or* 47 (1978) 76-80 (and for a later period, Zadok, *Tel Aviv* 6 [1979] 172-173, with additional bibliography). For a possible Jew (or Israelite) at Nippur in the time of Sin-shumu-lishir, see Zadok, *Jews in Babylonia*, pp. 34-35.

74. Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 44 and 58-60, *OIP* 2 52-54; Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 52-53 Episode 13; Piepkorn, *AS* 5 70.

75. For more than fifteen months in 690-689 and for more than two years in 650-648. Borsippa and Ur also endured long sieges in the seventh century. For an illustration of a late-eighth-century Babylonian walled city with its towers and fortifications, see the (damaged) representation of Dilbat on a Sennacherib relief. Paterson, *Assyrian Sculptures: Palace of Sennacherib*, pl. 13 (epigraph in *OIP* 2 157 no. 26).

76. *Or* 34 (1965) 249-251, *Or* 38 (1969) 336-339.

77. This was Ningal-iddin, the father of Sin-balassu-iqbi. *UET* 4 27 and 90.

The tribes seem generally to have remained outside the province system and to have operated under their own leaders. The Chaldean tribes Bit-Yakin and Bit-Dakkuri and the Aramean tribes Gambulu and Puqudu were politically the most powerful groups in the land. What prevented them from dominating the entire country was that they seldom agreed to work under common direction for a common purpose. When an exceptional leader such as Merodach-baladan or Mushezib-Marduk appeared and personally won their allegiance, the disparate tribes could work together with the rest of Babylonia and offer surprisingly effective resistance to the militarily superior Assyrians. Occasionally there were strained relations or hostile incidents between tribe and tribe or between a tribe and the older population. This seems seldom to have developed into long-lasting or deep-seated enmity; but, in the case of Ur and the Bit-Yakin tribe (which controlled much of Ur's hinterland),⁷⁸ there was continuing friction that erupted into warfare several times during the period.

Though politically weak and internationally insignificant in the mid-eighth century, Babylonia nonetheless enjoyed a limited regional importance. She formed the vulnerable southern border of Assyria, and she stood astride several important trade routes: the southern section of the Euphrates (which was a crucial link in commerce between the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean), the beginning of the Baghdad-Kermanshah-Hamadan road to the east, the overland route to Elam via Der, and the developing caravan tracks west onto the Arabian desert. Assyria, as it grew into an imperial power, could not afford to ignore disruptive tribesmen close to its southern frontier who not only menaced the outskirts of Assyria itself but threatened the Babylonian hub of international trade. Assyria thus made a concerted effort to neutralize destabilizing influences in Babylonia, and this it did primarily by launching a series of massive strikes against Babylonia's tribal population. The ensuing struggle between the Assyrians and the tribesmen dominated the political history of Babylonia from 745 to 626.

Assyrian initiatives in Babylonia took a variety of forms, including campaigns into tribal areas, wholesale deportation of tribal populations, diplomatic efforts to secure the allegiance of the non-tribal urbanites, and direct intervention in government through the installation of Assyrian or pro-Assyrian rulers on the Babylonian throne.⁷⁹ Campaigns into tribal

78. Including, at various times, the towns of Eridu, Larsa, and Kissik (*OIP* 2 53; cf. Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 58, 64).

79. In effect making Babylonia a client state.

regions tended to focus on fortified towns, which were unable to withstand aggressive Assyrian siege techniques. The effectiveness of this strategy varied in direct proportion to the percentage of the tribal population found in these towns; the tactic was essentially a failure in the case of the relatively non-sedentary Arameans and only a qualified success in the case of the Chaldeans, who took somewhat longer to regroup. Deportation was another technique much in favor with the Assyrians; it was employed several times on a large scale in Babylonia in the second half of the eighth century, both to export insurgent tribesmen and to import potentially more docile inhabitants from other lands.⁸⁰ According to official if tendentious Assyrian statistics, almost half a million people were removed from Babylonia between 745 and 702; and more than half of these were Chaldeans.⁸¹ The combined tactics of repeated military campaigns and deportations were responsible for the eclipse of the Bit-Yakin tribe in the seventh century and for the temporary ascendancy of the Bit-Dakkuri among the Chaldeans between 693 and 675.⁸² For most of the period under consideration (85 out of 121 years), Assyria controlled the Babylonian throne either by having the Assyrian monarch personally rule also as king of Babylonia or by installing one of its own nominees—sometimes a member of the Assyrian royal family—as king.⁸³ The latter method

80. This included interchange of the populations of Bit-Yakin and Commagene (Kummuhu); see Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 64 and 72 (more fully in Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, p. 118 [= ARAB 2 § 64]). Note the biblical references to Babylonian deportees from this period: 2 Kings 17:24, Ezra 4:9-10; cf. Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, IX.xiv.3. Cf. Caquot in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, pp. 9-16 and Lipiński, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics* 1 77-82.

81. *Power and Propaganda*, p. 227 and nn. 27-31. The figures for the Babylonian deportations, which may be calculated in various ways, reached at least 472,010 people: (a) 155,000 deported from Bit-Shilani and Bit-Sha'alli by Tiglath-pileser III (Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, pl. XXXIV 14 [= ARAB 1 § 806, with incorrect number], with an emendation of ME for the second LIM in the number in Rost's copy); (b) 18,430 deported after the capture of Dur-Athara by Sargon (Lie, *Sargon*, p. 44:279); (c) 90,580 deported after the invasion of Bit-Yakin by Sargon (Lie, *Sargon*, p. 62:6); (d) 208,000 deported by Sennacherib after his first campaign (*OIP* 2 55:80). To these might be added the 5,400 people deported from Duru (Diru) and the 600 from the town Amlatu of the Damunu tribe (Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, pl. III 2).

82. Except for brief intervals, Bit-Yakin was the preeminent Chaldean tribe from 850 to 694. One of its leaders, Nabu-bel-shumati, was subsequently in command of anti-Assyrian forces in the south during the Shamash-shum-ukin rebellion (652-648); but the later history of Bit-Yakin was for the most part merged with that of the Sealand.

83. The calculation is for the years 747-627, inclusive; it is impossible at present to judge whether the Assyrians or Babylonians effectively controlled the throne in 626. For Assyrian experiments with different types of nominees, see *JCS* 25 (1973) 90-92.

eventually proved more successful; and two long reigns from 667-627 stabilized the Babylonian monarchy and provided support for the burgeoning economy—despite the notable interruption of the Great Rebellion (652-648). Assyria did not always respect the territorial integrity of Babylonia, especially east of the Tigris; at various times she incorporated such centers as Der, Lahiru, Hilimmu, and Pillatu within her own borders, albeit with only mixed success.⁸⁴ In the area of local administration within Babylonia, Assyria in the late eighth century attempted to override the structure of small provincial units when Sargon divided the land into two large provinces with one governor in Babylon and another in the eastern region of Gambulu.⁸⁵ The new system did not succeed and may have been abandoned already in the next reign.⁸⁶ Assyria conducted local administration either by appointing Babylonians on whom it could rely or by installing Assyrian emissaries, the latter usually in minor positions and for shorter periods.⁸⁷ Officials serving in Babylonia from the king down to local temple stewards were required to take a loyalty oath (*adû*) to the Assyrian monarch and to promise that they would faithfully report to the Assyrian court any subversive actions or plots.⁸⁸ The Assyrians did not maintain control in Babylonia by stationing large garrisons on Babylonian soil, but relied on an efficient intelligence network to direct army units based in Assyria to major trouble spots.⁸⁹ The local Assyrian military policy was one of defense-in-depth, quickly suppressing

64. E.g., PKB, p. 240; VAS I 70 (Der in the reigns of Shalmaneser V and Sargon II according to a kudurru). Note however that Der was still reckoned among the Babylonian cities in some of Sargon's royal inscriptions (e.g., *ZDMG* 72 [1918] 176:4); and its anomalous situation at this time may have been due to the fortunes of war. Assyrian annexation of Babylonian territories is in need of further investigation.

85. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 66. The latter may have been designed primarily as a tribal jurisdiction for the whole region. It should be noted that there is no independent evidence that Sargon's restructuring was actually put into practice.

86. Under Sennacherib, Mushezib-Marduk from Bit-Dakkuri was subject to the Assyrian governor of Lahiru (*OIP* 2 41:42); note also the remarks about the jurisdictional status of Lahiru by Parpola, *LAS* 2 264.

87. Assyrian bureaucracy and its shortcomings in Babylonia are discussed in *Power and Propaganda*, pp. 232-233.

88. See the discussion by Malbran-Labat, *L'armée*, pp. 31-40. Note too that delegations from Babylonian cities were sent to Assyria in the time of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal (e.g., *ABL* 287, 327; Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 28-30).

89. Minor disturbances were dealt with by small local forces.

insurgence with forces from outside rather than laying an extensive internal network to forestall revolt.⁹⁰

Assyrian relations with the older urban centers of Babylonia deserve further comment. Previous Assyrian rulers in the ninth and early eighth centuries had had a special relationship with the venerable religious cities of the northwest alluvium, notably Babylon, Borsippa, and Cutha; they had bestowed gifts on the major temples and had sponsored sacrifices there.⁹¹ Shalmaneser III (858-824) had entertained the citizens of Babylon and Borsippa at splendid banquets and presented them with festal garments and other gifts.⁹² In the late eighth and seventh centuries, when the Assyrian monarchs came to rule either directly or through intermediaries in southern Mesopotamia, they increased efforts to establish solidarity between themselves and Babylonian city-dwellers. They pursued a tactic of attempting to separate this urban population from the tribesmen; in times of unrest, they appealed directly to the men of Babylon for support against Chaldean and other rebels, such as Mukin-zeri and Shamash-shum-ukin.⁹³ To secure this political allegiance, the Assyrians offered political and economic advantages to the city-dwellers and to their temples. Most Assyrian monarchs of this time sent generous offerings to the major deities of Babylonia, particularly to Marduk and Nabu.⁹⁴ They renewed the traditional privileges of the citizens of the old religious centers, including freedom from certain taxes.⁹⁵ Sargon attempted to

90. Assyrian defense policies in Babylonia and the role of its intelligence apparatus are described in *Power and Propaganda*, p. 235.

91. PKB, pp. 197 and 217. It has been suggested that these three centers constituted a major pilgrimage route in northern Babylonia.

92. PKB, p. 197.

93. NL 1 (*Iraq* 17 [1955] 23-24); ABL 301 (= Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia*, no. 115.).

94. Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, pl. XXXIV 9-10 (= ARAB 1 § 804); Lie, *Sargon*, p. 58 (and see n. 121 below); Borger, *Asarh.* p. 24 Episode 33; Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 226-248; BIN 2 132 (Puqudu tribesmen dedicated to the goddesses Ishtar and Nanaya in Uruk); ABL 1241+ CT 54 112 rev. 10-11. Note Assyrian supervision of the temple treasury in Dur-Sharruku according to ABL 339 (= LAS 1 no. 293; LAS 2 511).

95. Lyon, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, p. 1 (= ARAB 2 § 117); Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 25-26 Episode 37. See also the Fürstenspiegel (latest edition by Lambert, *BWL*, pp. 110-115); see further the discussions by Leemans (in M. David *et al.*, eds., *Symbolae van Oen*, pp. 36-61), Diakonoff (*AS* 16 343-349), Brinkman (in Garelli, ed., *Palais*, p. 415, and in *CAH* 3/1, 2nd ed., p. 291), and Reiner and Civil (*Diakonoff Fs.*, pp. 320-326, with publication of a new duplicate).

broaden his base of support by extending comparable privileges to such southern cities as Uruk, Ur, Kissik, and Eridu, which do not seem to have had them previously.⁹⁶ But, except in the far south,⁹⁷ acceptance of Assyrian rule seems generally to have been lukewarm; and cities that sided with Assyria ran the risk of finding themselves isolated from their countrymen. As the governor of Nippur wrote to the Assyrian court:

The king knows that people everywhere hate us because of our allegiance to Assyria. We are not safe anywhere; wherever we might go, we would be killed. People say, "Why did you submit to Assyria?" We have now locked our city gates and do not go forth⁹⁸

Even under Esaraddon, who made a show of restoring Babylon and reinstating its privileges, there were tax protests in the capital and obvious signs of Assyrian unpopularity.⁹⁹ In times of major revolt,¹⁰⁰ cities in the northwest supported the anti-Assyrian side, even though they were particularly vulnerable to Assyrian reprisals.¹⁰¹ Thus the Assyrian policy of cultivating Babylonian urban centers for religious and political reasons yielded marginal results that on the whole were not favorable to Assyria, especially after the accession of Sennacherib.¹⁰²

Anti-Assyrian resistance in Babylonia was generally led by the Chaldeans. Revolts which brought a member of the older Babylonian population to the throne were invariably taken over and the Babylonian candidate displaced in favor of a Chaldean within a few weeks or months.¹⁰³ Before the time of Sennacherib, the Chaldeans chose tribal

96. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 64.

97. Where cities such as Uruk and Ur, which were situated in enclaves in tribal territory, saw an advantage in having an Assyrian defender.

98. ABL 327 (= Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia*, no. 121).

99. ABL 327 and 340 (= LAS 1 no. 276).

100. Notably in 703, 694-689, 652-648.

101. The history of Nippur, including its seventh-century swings between pro- and anti-Assyrianism, deserves detailed study.

102. The alleged political influence of a pro-Assyrian party in Babylonia and of a pro-Babylonian party in Assyria has yet to be subjected to a critical investigation of the evidence. Note, for instance, the reservations expressed by Garelli in A. Finet, ed., *La voix de l'opposition en Mésopotamie*, p. 197.

103. Nabu-shuma-ukin II replaced by Mukin-zeri (Bit-Amukani) in 732; Marduk-zakir-shumi II replaced by Merodach-baladan II (Bit Yakin) in 703; Nergal-ushezib replaced by Mushezib-Marduk (Bit-Dakkuri) in 693, although in this case the former king had been captured and removed by the Assyrians.

areas as sites for their military engagements against the Assyrians, perhaps because they were unsure of the support of the older urban population. After Sennacherib's accession, many of the battles took place in northern Babylonia near cities;¹⁰⁴ and the Chaldeans were able to draw on urbanites, Aramean tribesmen, and foreign contingents for assistance. Not all Chaldeans were consistently anti-Assyrian. The Assyrians may occasionally have manipulated the accession of well-disposed chieftains,¹⁰⁵ and Chaldean soldiers served with the Assyrian army.¹⁰⁶ By the middle of the seventh century, Bit-Amukani had effectively fallen under Assyrian domination and was itself subject to Aramean raids.¹⁰⁷ But in general, especially between 732 and 646, the Chaldeans were the mainstay of anti-Assyrian politics in Babylonia; and occasional extraordinary tribal leaders were able to combine the political strength of their unified tribes, economic power based on animal husbandry and trade, and the tactical benefits of their environment¹⁰⁸ to good advantage in barring the Assyrians.¹⁰⁹

Over the years, repeated Assyrian attacks on the tribal countryside and Assyrian interference in Babylonian government stimulated the growth of more effective political and military strategies among both the older Babylonians and the tribal populations. Babylonia under Assyrian stress became more adept at exploiting its natural resources—especially its hydrological features—for offensive and defensive purposes. The utilization of marshes¹¹⁰ as bases for mobile raiding parties and the

104. Perhaps because Sennacherib even early in his reign may have been perceived as anti-Babylonian.

105. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 52 Episode 12; *PRT* 139 rev. 6-12.

106. *PRT* 105 rev. 11; cf. possibly *ABL* 564.6-7, *ABL* 742.4-5 as well as nn. 185 and 188 below. Further pertinent material will be published by Dalley and Postgate, *CTN* 3.

107. *ABL* 275, cf. *ABL* 896 and *PRT* 139 rev. 6-12.

108. Particularly the marshy terrain and the dispersed population.

109. Cf. *AJA* 76 (1972) 279, Frame, *dis.*, chapter 5, section 2. The Chaldean economic base (especially agriculture and trade) would have been particularly vulnerable to Assyrian military moves.

110. Note, however, that there is still disagreement among geographers about the extent and character of the southern Babylonian marshes in the first millennium B.C.: W. C. Brice, ed., *Environmental History*, Part IV; J. F. Hansman, "The Mesopotamian Delta in the First Millennium, B.C.," *Geographical Journal* 144 (1978) 49-61. For the delta region in general, see C. Larsen, *JAOS* 95 (1975) 43-57; C. Larsen and G. Evans in W. C. Brice, ed., *Environmental History*, pp. 227-244; W. A. MacFadyen and C. Vita-Finzi, *Geological Magazine* 115 (1978) 287-300; C. Vita-Finzi in W. C. Brice, ed., *Environmental History*, pp. 255-261.

deliberate shifting of watercourses (either to put pressure on unsympathetic cities or for defensive flooding around tribal towns)¹¹¹ evince a heightened awareness of the tactical potential of the environment in resisting a militarily superior enemy.¹¹² In addition, Babylonians and Chaldeans broadened anti-Assyrian resistance into a regional movement by bringing in their nearby trading partners, the Elamites and Arabs, to furnish auxiliary troops for hostilities in Babylonia. This inevitably expanded the theater of conflict into neighboring lands, which presented formidable natural obstacles for Assyrian armies: hills and mountains in Elam, desert in Arabia, and extremes of climate in both areas. Furthermore, in times of stress, there appeared a remarkable series of leaders, especially from the Chaldean Bit-Yakin tribe, who commanded substantial strength from the various parts of Babylonia: Merodach-baladan, Mushezib-Marduk, and Nabu-bel-shumati, to name only the most prominent.¹¹³ These leaders, with a core of support from their native tribe, learned to rally widespread anti-Assyrian forces from other tribes and the older population of Babylonia, as well as from foreign lands. Eventually these traditional alliances were available to assist even the Assyrian arch-rebel, Shamash-shum-ukin, who led Babylonia and its allies in a devastating blow to the unity of the Assyrian empire. Unquestionably, the perennially interfering presence of a strong Assyria spurred the political and military development of Babylonia in the eighth and seventh centuries.

Despite the focus of much of the extant documentation, Babylonian-Assyrian contacts at this time were not entirely political or military. The venerable culture of Babylonia with its flourishing traditions of scholarship, *belles lettres*, and ancient religion exerted a strong attraction for Assyria. Beginning in the second half of the eighth century, Babylonian

111. Merodach-baladan in particular made use of defensive flooding as a tactic against Sargon's troops both at Dur-Athara (710) and Dur-Yakin (709). Note also the physical traces which such a procedure might be expected to leave (see the Euphrates cut described by Wright in Adams, *Hearland of Cities*, pp. 333-334). Powell, *JCS* 34 (1982) 59-61, has discussed the dimensions of the defensive construction works at Dur-Yakin. That marshes were regarded as a natural habitat for rebels is indicated in the Assyrian royal annals (*OIP* 2 42).

112. The use of flooding from watercourses as an integral part of military strategy is known from earlier periods in lower Mesopotamia. See Rowton, *AOAT* 1 309.

113. The older Babylonian population produced few leaders who were able to survive even a short time. See n. 103 above.

astronomy experienced a significant revival, and astronomical observations were again recorded with great care.¹¹⁴ There is also evidence of at least a passing interest in horticulture.¹¹⁵ Babylonian scribes cultivated the tradition of Mesopotamian lexical scholarship,¹¹⁶ and the stylistic quality of longer royal inscriptions under Merodach-baladan and Shamasb-shum-ukin shows that scribal authors were striving with mixed success to emulate literary models.¹¹⁷ Babylonian literary and scientific works occupied a prominent place in Assyrian libraries; and Ashurbanipal, when augmenting his palace collection of cuneiform tablets, sent emissaries to search through Babylonian temple archives as well as collections in private houses.¹¹⁸ Individual Babylonians were brought to Assyria to be educated as scribes and courtiers, in the hope that they would one day prove loyal to Assyria.¹¹⁹ Even the landscape of the south held a fascination for the Assyrians: Sennacherib, when planning amenities for his renovated capital at Nineveh, laid out a park imitating the Chaldean countryside with its distinctive trees, marshes, and wildlife.¹²⁰ It is difficult to estimate the cultural impact of Babylonia on Assyria in the sphere of religion; Assyrian kings proudly recorded their offerings to Babylonian temples¹²¹ and celebrated a New Year's Festival (*akitu*) in Assyria, but we

114. PKB, p. 227 and *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 49 under 44.3.12; Walker, *BSMS* 5 (1983) 20-21. The oldest known Babylonian astronomical diary refers to the year 652 in the reign of Shamasb-shum-ukin (Sachs in F. R. Hodson, ed., *The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World*, p. 48). Regarding the location of contemporary astronomical observatories and astronomical schools in Babylonia, see the remarks by Parpola, *LAS* 2.268 and n. 481 (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 500-503 for Babylonian writers of astronomical reports as attested in the Nineveh archives).

115. *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 48 under 44.3.5. The Assyrians also recorded timber and spices taken as booty from Babylonia, particularly in the time of Tiglath-pileser III (Rost, *Tiglath-pileser*, pp. 60-62 = ARAB 1 §794).

116. Copies of *Erimbuš* (VAT 13100) and other lexical series were made at this time.

117. VAS 1 37; *Iraq* 15 (1953) 123-134; Lehmann, *Šamašsumukin* 2 6-8. For similarities between a text of Merodach-baladan's and the *Erra* Epic, see n. 230 below.

118. Parpola, *JNES* 42 (1983) 11; CT 22 1 (= Waterman, *RCAE* 4 212-214 no. 6; Pfeiffer, *State Letters of Assyria*, no. 256); Moren, *RA* 74 (1980) 190-191. Cf. M. Elat, *BiOr* 39 (1982) 5-25.

119. *OIP* 2 54; Parpola, *Iraq* 34 (1972) 33-34.

120. *OIP* 2 97; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 115-116.

121. Note especially the lavish gifts of Sargon (Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, pp. 124-126 = ARAB 2 §70).

do not know how much of this was due to Babylonian influence and how much may have been reshaping of native Assyrian customs. In the realm of law, there was a mingling of Babylonian and Assyrian traditions in a few legal documents dated early in the reign of Esarhaddon;¹²² but it is unclear whether this ever went beyond the adoption of a few superficial traits of style.¹²³ In material culture, notably in the few surviving examples of contemporary Babylonian architecture, in glyptic, and in ceramics, there were new aesthetic and stylistic developments, perhaps influenced by Assyrian advances;¹²⁴ but this has yet to be satisfactorily studied. One would not expect that, after 625, the architectural and artistic achievements of the dynasty of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar came to fruition without relation to their native predecessors.

When viewed from a broader regional perspective, Babylonia was involved in a close network of relationships with nearby lands. Ties with Assyria were traditional, but now were unavoidably heightened because of Assyria's direct political involvement in the south. Relations with the Elamites and Arabs developed more spontaneously as a result of geographical proximity, commercial ties, mingling of populations, and shared political interests (usually anti-Assyrian). Fleeting Babylonian contact with the state of Judah in Palestine may have been motivated by common antipathy to Assyrian encroachments.

Babylonian-Arab relations in the late eighth and seventh centuries are sparsely attested; but there is a general pattern of commercial and social interaction, light Arab settlement on the outskirts of Babylonia, and occasional Arab military assistance to Babylonia in its anti-Assyrian

122. Cf. Postgate's suggestion that the Sargonid kings' increased concern with law and justice—at least in their royal inscriptions—may have been due to closer contacts with Babylonia (in Garelli, ed., *Palais*, p. 417). Was this primarily a literary topos, fostered at least initially by Sargon's precarious position as a usurper?

123. There are also in the seventh century a few rare instances of Babylonian use of the Assyrian style of dating by eponymy, though the Babylonians in these cases usually dated by their own officials and not by the canonical eponyms of Assyria. There are also examples of a post-canonical eponym attested in texts found at Dur-Kurigalzu. See *JCS* 35 (1983) 61-62; Pinches, *AfO* 13 (1939-41) 51-52; Frame, *RA* 76 (1982) 157-166.

124. There seems, for example, to be a local variant of Assyrian palace ware (McGuire Gibson, personal communication). For glyptic, see the general remarks by Porada, *Or* 16 (1947) 145-165 and de Miroschedji, *RA* 76 (1982) 53; see also n. 596 below. For architecture, see n. 586.

struggles.¹²⁵ In the time of Sennacherib, the queen of the Arabs sent her brother with troops to assist Merodach-baladan in the rebellion of 703.¹²⁶ Half a century later, Arab chieftains and their men endured considerable hardship in Babylon with Shamash-shum-ukin when the city was under Assyrian siege.¹²⁷ There is also scattered and occasionally ambiguous evidence for penetration of Arabs or Arab influence into Babylonia: Arab toponyms in western Chaldea in the late eighth century,¹²⁸ small population movements of Arab tribesmen between Eridu and Qedar territory on the desert,¹²⁹ the visit of a merchant from Tema to the king of Babylon,¹³⁰ an Arab raid on Sippar,¹³¹ new small settlements just off the desert to the south of Ur,¹³² and a growing number of Arab or Phoenician trade objects—as well as inscriptions in a script akin to early epigraphic South Arabic—found in first-millennium levels in excavations in southern Mesopotamia (principally at Nippur, Uruk, and Ur).¹³³

Babylonia's most valued ally was Elam, its eastern neighbor, which also possessed a literate urban civilization. Babylonia and Elam had close trade relations, shared religious interests,¹³⁴ and often pursued a common anti-

125. A general treatment of the Arabs in the mid-first millennium may be found in Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*. For the onomastic evidence in Mesopotamia, see most recently Zadok, *ZDMG* 131 (1981) 42-84 (pp. 66-68 of this article deal specifically with pre-Nabopolassar Babylonia).

126. *OIP* 2 51.

127. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 68.

128. Eph'al, *JAOS* 94 (1974) 108-115; Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, pp. 112-116. An attempt to see Arab residents in some of the larger cities of Babylonia is based on a disputed interpretation of the designation (LÚ) *urbi* in *OIP* 2 54; *urbi* is now generally dissociated from Arabs (see Eph'al's discussion in *JAOS* 94 [1974] 110-111 n. 16 and *Ancient Arabs*, p. 113).

129. *UET* 4 167. The inhabitants of the desert area are named LÚ *qu-da-ri*.

130. *ABL* 1404.

131. *ABL* 88.

132. Wright in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 333 notes small unprotected settlements directly adjacent to the desert. There is of course no explicit evidence for connecting these settlements with the Arabs.

133. Kienast, *UVB* 14 43-44; Brinkman, *Or* 34 (1965) 258 n. 1; Biggs, *BASOR* 179 (1965) 36-38; Eph'al, *JAOS* 94 (1974) 109-110; cf. Zadok, *ZDMG* 131 (1981) 78-79. The exact date of the objects and inscriptions has yet to be determined.

134. Statues of Babylonian gods were on occasion removed to Elam, and Elamite kings and officials took an interest in and sometimes sent offerings to temples in Der, Uruk, and other Babylonian cities. This inevitably assumed political overtones.

Assyrian policy. The eastern tribal regions of Babylonia abutted on the Elamite border; and the nearby large tribes of Gambulu and Bit-Yakin traditionally had close ties with the Elamite monarchs and people.¹³⁵ During the period of most coordinated Chaldean resistance to Assyria, first under Merodach-baladan and later under Mushezib-Marduk, Elamite troops became heavily involved in fighting in Babylonia. Chaldean leaders in time of major crisis sent substantial gifts (*ta'tu*)¹³⁶ to secure Elamite support; and large Elamite armies took part in decisive field battles in or near northern Babylonia.¹³⁷ Elamite generals played prominent roles at the battle of Kish in 703 and at Halule in 691.¹³⁸ Besides providing direct military aid to Babylonia, Elam on occasion received and harbored political fugitives from Assyrian wrath—notably Merodach-baladan (after 700) and Nabu-bel-shumati (after 648).¹³⁹ Relations between Elam and Bit-Yakin were particularly strong and undoubtedly accounted for some of the staying power in the lengthy Chaldean resistance movement in southern Mesopotamia.¹⁴⁰

But Babylonia's eastern alliance could not always be relied on. The Elamite monarchy especially after 693 was subject to periods of instability because of the uncertain health of some kings and because of frequent revolutions.¹⁴¹ There were also times of political fragmentation, when two

135. There were also minor Aramean tribes such as the Yashian along the Babylonian-Elamite border in the vicinity of the regions Pīlātu (Assyrian: Pīlutu) and Rāshī; and the frontier was sufficiently porous to allow free movement of semi-nomadic groups. De Miroschedji, *DAFI* 12 (1981) 172, suggests that Susiana itself may have had by this time a substantial pastoral population of Aramean immigrants from Mesopotamia; cf. the more general remarks on the presence of Semites in western Elam by Vallat, *Suse et l'Elam*, p. 3.

136. Sometimes translated "bribe." It should be stressed, however, that there was nothing illegal in these payments, although on occasion the Assyrians objected to Babylonian temple property being used for such purposes. A useful discussion of the concept of *ta'tu* or *datu(m)* may be found in K. Veenhof, *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and its Terminology* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), pp. 219-228; cf. Tadmor and Cogan, *Biblica* 60 (1979) 499-503.

137. Note particularly the battles of Der (720), Cutha and Kish (703), and Halule (691).

138. *OIP* 2 45 and 51. The evidence for 691 is unclear.

139. On occasion, however, Elam either put such fugitives to death or threatened to hand them over to Assyria (Nabu-zer-kitti-lisur and Nabu-bel-shumati).

140. Further research is desirable on economic and cultural relations between Elam and Babylonia, since these connections were probably close. See the preliminary remarks on similarities in glyptic by de Miroschedji, *RA* 76 (1982) 63.

141. Babylonian Chronicle ii 32-33, iii 6-8, 13-14, 19-21, 30-31 (text in *TCS* 5 77-81); Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 32-34, etc. Note also the premature death of Humban-haltash II in 675.

or more kings ruled simultaneously in such centers as Susa, Madaktu, and Haidalu.¹⁴² After 670, Elam was beset by vagaries of climate: drought led to famine and caused people to flee the country.¹⁴³ On occasion, Elam drew diplomatically closer to Assyria, especially in the quarter century between 690 and 665; in the time of Esarhaddon a formal peace agreement was concluded between the two lands, and Assyria later provided sustenance and shelter for Elamites hard pressed by food shortages.¹⁴⁴

Generally, however, Elam backed Babylonia in its struggle against Assyria. Between 652 and 648, although three Elamite kings were deposed in quick succession, each new ruler soon adopted the country's anti-Assyrian and pro-Babylonian stance.¹⁴⁵ This policy on occasion led to Elamite invasions of southern Mesopotamia when the Babylonian throne was occupied by an Assyrian monarch,¹⁴⁶ and such incursions occasionally resulted in the harsh treatment of Babylonian cities such as Sippar.¹⁴⁷ But in general, Elamite-Babylonian relations were cordial and not just between the tribal populations and the Elamites; there were also direct contacts between the older, urban inhabitants—especially the family of Gahal—and Elam.¹⁴⁸ Elam was intimately involved in the political fate of

142. The observations of G. Cameron, *History of Early Iran*, chapters 9 and 11 are still pertinent, although needing revision in detail.

143. Piepkorn, AS 5 56-58; cf. ABL 295.

144. Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 58-59; Piepkorn, AS 5 56-58; Nassouhi, *AfK* 2 (1924-25) 102. Parpola, *Iraq* 34 (1972) 34 n. 66, has suggested that Assyrian princes and princesses at one time resided at the Elamite court and younger members of the Elamite royal family at the Assyrian capital; but one would prefer more explicit evidence for this than the pronominal suffixes used in the greeting formula of ABL 918.

145. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 32-62.

146. In 694 (by Hallushu-Inshushinak against Ashur-nadin-shumi), in 675 (by Humban-haltash II in the time of Esarhaddon, but see n. 380 below), and about 664 (by Urtak in the time of Shamash-shum-ukin).

147. Babylonian Chronicle ii 41, iv 9 (text in TCS 5 78, 83; see also n. 380 below).

148. The king of Elam installed Nergal-ushezib of the Gahal family on the Babylonian throne in 694; and an Elamite princess (sister of Tammariu) married a man of the Gahal (ABL 282; *Power and Propaganda*, pp. 237-238 and n. 135). Matthew Stolper has pointed out that it is at least conceivable that the use of "sister's son" (DUMUNIN) to refer to the relationship of Shuma to Tammariu implies a genealogical claim to the Elamite throne on the part of a member of the Gahal family; compare Elamite succession customs in both the era of the *sukkalmahs* and in the Middle Elamite period (for the at least partial continuance of such customs in the first millennium, note the reference in the Babylonian Chronicle i 40 [text in TCS 5 75] concerning the relationship of Shutur-Nahhunte to Humban-nikash I).

Babylonia, especially in the three quarters of a century between 720 and 646;¹⁴⁹ and Elamite support or lack thereof was often decisive in determining the political strength of such anti-Assyrian movements as the Chaldean resistance (721-689) and the Great Rebellion (652-648). Had Elam itself enjoyed greater political stability, the hegemony of the Assyrian empire might not have been so long-lived.¹⁵⁰

The Babylonian economy too should be placed in regional perspective, although documentary evidence is sparse and much essential research in this area remains to be done. It would be anachronistic to regard Babylonia throughout the late eighth and seventh centuries as merely a desiccated shadow of its former self, possessing a high culture of venerable antiquity, but seriously underpopulated, politically weak, and generally poverty-stricken. In the seventh century, as the Babylonian monarchy gradually stabilized and longer reigns provided greater continuity in governance, there are signs of increasing economic prosperity: a significant rise in the number of economic records, growing concern with land tenure and the maintenance of irrigation networks, developing technology and trade, and more ambitious construction programs (both monumental and residential).¹⁵¹ Babylonian temples served as important economic institutions; and projects requiring major capital expenditures, such as securing the intervention of Elamite armies, were on occasion financed from temple treasuries.¹⁵² The Babylonian economy continued to rest on the twin pillars of agriculture and animal husbandry, which provided the internal basis for extensive trade relations. Although the present state of research does not permit a detailed analysis of the Babylonian economy, we can at this juncture offer a few preliminary observations.

149. This connection was recognized by the compiler of the first of the great Neo-Babylonian chronicles (TCS 5 no. 1), who carefully recorded the accession and death dates for the monarchs of the three countries Babylonia, Assyria, and Elam.

150. Besides the Elamites and the Arabs, Babylonia also had modest contacts with the Suteans (principally as warriors in the time of Sargon and Sennacherib), Dilmun (in connection with Nabu-bel-shumati at the time of the Great Rebellion), and Nabateans (in connection with Arab assistance for Shamash-shum-ukin). Ashurbanipal mentions that Shamash-shum-ukin's revolt was supported by the kings of Gutium, Amurru, and Meluhha (see p. 95 below); it is possible that these anachronistic designations may indicate areas more remote than Elam and the Arabian desert.

151. An even more significant indication of prosperity may be the wealth of ordinary people as reflected in the richness of contemporary grave gifts at Nippur (McCown and Haines, *OIP* 78 147).

152. *OIP* 2 42; Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 13 Episode 4.

Babylonian agriculture in this period concentrated primarily on producing barley and dates, which were grown extensively even in tribal areas. Most surviving real-estate transactions involving rural land concerned date-palm groves, often located in marshy terrain near large cities.¹⁵³ Wine was produced locally in hilly regions east of the Tigris such as Hirimmu,¹⁵⁴ but was not a significant commercial crop. Perhaps unexpectedly, Babylonia in the early first millennium appears as a producer and exporter of timber; the southern and eastern sections of the country (especially Chaldea and Hararatu) grew *musukkannu* trees,¹⁵⁵ which were prized for palace construction.¹⁵⁶ There are many and varied references to agricultural land in legal contracts; and the introduction of revised toponymic terminology indicates shifting patterns at the lower levels of rural society. By the late eighth century,¹⁵⁷ there was a new unit of local agricultural administration called the "Fifty" (*ḥanšū*)¹⁵⁸ presided over by the "Commander of the Fifty" (*rab ḥanšē*),¹⁵⁹ who seems to have been a

153. One notes that old river (or canal) beds were also used for agricultural purposes (*TuM* NF 2-3 14:1-2).

154. *OIP* 2 26, 55, etc.

155. Botanical identification not yet established.

156. Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, pp. 60, 74 (= *ARAB* 1 §§792, 804); *OIP* 2 26, 54, 57. Cf. now the discussion by Fales, *Studi Pintore*, pp. 75-76.

157. Peat, *Iraq* 45 (1983) 126, suggests that the institution of *ḥanšū* land may have originated with either Merodach-baladan II (721-710) or Erība-Marduk (c. 765). At present, *ḥanšū* land is attested only over two centuries, from 718 to 502 B.C. (*AnOr* 9 1:98; *VAS* 5 92:1-2). It is seen primarily in northwestern Babylonia (around Borsippa, Babylon, Dilbat, Kish-Hursagkalama) and to a lesser extent near Nippur and Uruk.

158. The "Fifty" was an area of agricultural land used for growing barley or dates or for grazing (e.g., Strassmaier, *Nbk.*, 330:1-2; *TuM* NF 2-3 153:1-2; *YOS* 3 11:9-12). Peat (*Iraq* 45 [1983] 125) suggests that *ḥanšū* land may have been of a standard width (*šiddu*), namely 50 *ammatu*; but his premise that "in a normal sale text, great care is taken to define the exact length of each side of the plot which is being sold" simply does not apply in the vast majority of rural land sales in seventh-century Babylonia (when most cases of *ḥanšū* are attested). In the three cases where an exact measurement is given for an entire *ḥanšū*, the only listed dimension (length or width, i.e., *pātu* or *šiddu*) is uniformly set at 250 *ammatu* (*TCL* 12 11, *BIN* 1 130).

159. It is presumed here that the title and the agricultural unit were related, although this has yet to be demonstrated in context from the often stereotyped texts. It is worthy of note that the Neo-Babylonian *rab ḥanšē* is attested over the same chronological range as *ḥanšū* land, approximately the late eighth through sixth centuries. One should compare the similarly named (LÜ.)CAL.50 in Neo-Assyrian times (a selection of references may be found in *CAD* H 81) and at Nuzi (e.g., *JEN* 612:15).

local individual assigned responsibility for the unit¹⁶⁰ and liable for the equivalent of feudal obligations for the land.¹⁶¹ Local canals and irrigation works were often named the *ḥarru* (or *ḥarri*)¹⁶² of So-and-so (e.g., the canal "Ḥarri-of-Merodach-baladan"), and various Commanders of Fifties were allocated responsibility for the maintenance of segments of local irrigation systems.¹⁶³ These new developments and their ramifications must still be studied in detail.

Animal husbandry, practised by both the older settled population and the tribesmen, raised a variety of beasts: sheep, goats, bovines, donkeys, mules, and even horses and camels.¹⁶⁴ Transport animals were much in demand for the movement of goods and for military service; sheep's wool and goat-hair were used in the manufacture of textiles, a traditional Babylonian high-quality export.

Agriculture and livestock-raising thus created a local resource base to support trade. Babylonia, as observed earlier, was the crossroads of many

160. Single units in the eighth and seventh centuries usually bear the name of an individual, most often cited in some form such as "Fifty of Balatu, son of Nummur" (perhaps the name of the *rab ḥanšē*, although this would have to be demonstrated); in the sixth century, the units are most often called after extended family or clan groups such as "Fifty of the House of Ilutabani" or "Fifty of the House of the Reed-Worker." Larger groups of Fifties could be referred to generically as the "Fifties of the Men of Babylon" (50 *MES šā LÜ.DIN.TIR.KI ME*) or "Fifties of the Men of Uruk" (50-*ū*.*MES šā UNUC.KI-a-a*) or the like. A subdivision of the Fifty is the "Ten" (*eširtu*, written 10-*ti*), supervised by the "Commander of Ten" (*rab eširti*): *TCL* 12 11:7,12, *YOS* 3 103:10, although this is as yet poorly attested (cf. the juxtaposition of LÜ.CAL.50 and LÜ.CAL.10-*te* in *MSL* 12 239 iii 22-23, Neo-Assyrian lexical text). Is it possible that the *ḥanšū* and the *eširtu* were originally expected to furnish fifty or ten men for public works or service? [Note also the family name *Rab ḥimi* (LÜ.CAL.1 LIM) in *TCL* 12 11:18 and compare *CAD* L 198.]

161. *TuM* NF 2-3 132:2-5, one of the few non-stereotyped passages dealing with *ḥanšū* (but cf. the interpretation of Peat, *Iraq* 45 [1983] 124-125). In the sixth century, many of the texts concerning *ḥanšū* deal with its (taxable) yields in barley, dates, and wool. Land redivision or reassignment (*zu'u'zutu* or *masnaqtu*) by various kings in the eighth and seventh centuries (*VAS* 1 37 iii 51, *BM* 36479+4:6, *BM* 46799+2, *AnOr* 9 2:62) may have affected the distribution or allocation of *ḥanšū* land, since such land is occasionally mentioned in the same texts as the redivision (though the context is not unambiguous). It is noteworthy that a *ḥanšū* unit or shares in a *ḥanšū* unit could be sold along with the attendant service obligations.

162. The use of *ḥarru* in toponyms is attested already in Babylonia in the twelfth century (Nashef, *RCTC* 5 300), but it is not extensively used as a common noun for a watercourse before the eighth century.

163. *AnOr* 9 1.

164. The latter two were raised predominantly in eastern tribal regions.

trade routes reaching west to the Mediterranean and to the Arabian desert, north into Assyria, northeast into the Zagros mountains, east into Elam, and southeast by the Persian Gulf. Within this broad network, Babylonia not only exported its own products and imported necessities as well as luxury goods for its own consumption, but also served as an entrepôt for transshipment of goods from and to many foreign lands.¹⁶⁵ Along these radiating routes moved substantial amounts of cargo, some of it requisitioned by way of booty and tribute (an economic dimension of the Neo-Assyrian empire). In the late eighth and seventh centuries, Babylonia's most important export was people, removed in large numbers from tribal areas as well as from cities, especially over the six decades from 745 to 685.¹⁶⁶ Although these deportations are described in the Assyrian royal inscriptions primarily as political or military maneuvers,¹⁶⁷ they nonetheless had an economic side. Subject peoples, including Chaldeans and Arameans, were impressed into working on Sennacherib's massive urban renewal project for Nineveh and its environs;¹⁶⁸ and Babylonian Arameans were set to agricultural tasks in western Mesopotamia near Harran and in Syria.¹⁶⁹ The second most important export from Babylonia was animals, known mostly through Assyrian booty lists; these included transport and draft animals (oxen, donkeys, mules, horses, and camels), produce animals (cows, sheep, and goats), and to a much lesser extent exotic beasts such as wild boar.¹⁷⁰ Grain, dates, and wine were also taken

^{165.} At present we would be hard pressed to reconstruct from eighth- and seventh-century sources the full network of direct and indirect trade relationships for Babylonia, but one can obtain a preliminary notion of the magnitude of the network in the heyday of the sixth century from the texts treated by Oppenheim in *JCS* 21 (1967) 236-254. That trade on such a wide scale was not purely the development of the Neo-Babylonian empire of Nabopolassar and his successors is suggested by the seventh-century Babylonian or Babylonian-style bronzes found on Samos (Kyrieleis, *JdI* 94 [1979] 32-48; additional bibliography in n. 593 below).

^{166.} *Power and Propaganda*, pp. 227, 234-235; statistics for Sennacherib's depopulation of Babylonia are not available (Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 15 Episode 9; cf. *OIP* 2 83). Compare 2 Kings 17:24 (deportees from Babylon and Cutha to Samaria) and Ezra 4:9-10; see also p. 20 and n. 80 above.

^{167.} See p. 20 above.

^{168.} *OIP* 2 95.

^{169.} The Cambulu near Harran: see n. 242 below. Syria: Caquot and Lipiński references in n. 80 above. Note also the presence of a Chaldean in the Harran documents (Johns, *Doomsday Book*, no. 5 in 22 = Fales, *Censimenti*, no. 21).

^{170.} Among the bovines, oxen should presumably be classified primarily as draft animals. Wild boar were brought from the southern marshes to grace new swamps created in parks near Nineveh (*OIP* 2 115).

from Babylonia as spoil; and Chaldeans and Arameans were reckoned among the principal suppliers of wood for the decoration of the palace of Tiglath-pileser III.¹⁷¹ Durand has recently made a case for interpreting certain enigmatic Babylonian tags found in Assyria as "wool docket," i.e., labels attached to packets of wool at the time of shearing and then taken with other captured goods to Assyria after the fall of Dur-Yakin.¹⁷² Textiles, especially garments with multicolored trim, were also obtained from the south.¹⁷³ Reeds were cut down in the Chaldean marshes and brought to Assyria for use in construction.¹⁷⁴ Other items imported into Babylonia were captured by the Assyrians: silver, gold, precious stones, and luxury woods such as ebony;¹⁷⁵ the magnificence of such spoil conveys an impression of significant wealth among the ruling classes in Babylonia, particularly among tribal chieftains. As yet most movement of goods to and from Babylonia in this period must be reconstructed largely from forced transactions documented in the Assyrian booty and tribute lists;¹⁷⁶ we have no systematic information about the scale and scope of such exactions, much less of their impact on the Babylonian economy. It is possible that the geographical spread of the Assyrian empire expanded the market for Babylonian trade or at least facilitated the movement of Babylonian goods.¹⁷⁷

^{171.} E.g., Lie, *Sargon*, p. 46; *OIP* 2 26, 55, 57; Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, p. 74 (= *ARAB* 1 §804). Cf. *ADD* 1013 rev. 12-14.

^{172.} *JA* 267 (1979) 258-259. This is hardly the only way of explaining these dockets.

^{173.} Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, p. 62 (= *ARAB* 1 §794).

^{174.} *OIP* 2 95.

^{175.} Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, p. 62 (= *ARAB* 1 §794); Lie, *Sargon*, p. 60; *OIP* 2 56-57; Piepkorn, *AS* 5 70. One should also bear in mind, as Adams has pointed out, that luxury items of this type were more cost-effective to move by the limited Assyrian means of transport—hence the enhanced value of such acquisitions for the imperial treasury.

^{176.} This could be supplemented by the detailed representations of the Assyrian palace reliefs, e.g., Paterson, *Assyrian Sculptures: Palace of Sennacherib*, pls. 51-58, which show *inter alia* various types of animals and goods being removed by Assyrian soldiers from marsh areas; the marsh town of Sahritu is mentioned in an epigraph (*OIP* 2 157 no. 30). The role of the Babylonian city in foreign trade has yet to be systematically investigated for this period.

Note also the remarks of Garelli in H. van Effenterre, ed., *Points de vue sur la fiscalité antique*, p. 16.

^{177.} There is at present no evidence that the invention of coinage, which seems to have taken place in western Asia Minor in the seventh century, had an immediate impact in Babylonia. Even though there was a standard of weight called the "mina of Babylon" (*ABL* 180), payments in precious metals were usually made in block silver (*kaspu šibirtu*). But one should note Sennacherib's allusion (*OIP* 2 109) to the casting of half-shekel pieces in copper.

By the seventh century, the technology of the Iron Age was making inroads in Babylonia.¹⁷⁸ In addition to iron tools found at Nippur,¹⁷⁹ there is an increasing number of references in account texts to iron objects: nails, daggers, razors, bedsteads, and potstands.¹⁸⁰ There is also the first specific mention in a Babylonian document of an ironsmith (LÜ.SIMUC AN.BAR),¹⁸¹ which seems to be a new occupation in the land.¹⁸² At least some of the iron used in Babylonia was imported from Cilicia (*māt Ḥumē*).¹⁸³

Another topic about which we should like to be better informed for this period is the Babylonian military. The conquering armies of Nabopolassar, which in the two decades after 625 B.C. put an end to the Assyrian empire and then pushed west to win Carchemish and Syria, were not without their Babylonian forerunners, despite the relative silence of the texts. Nor should the heavy reliance of the Chaldeans on Elamite generals, officers, and soldiery (especially howmen) obscure the fact that the Chaldeans, Arameans, and older Babylonians had troops of their own and occasionally fought battles without substantial foreign aid. At Dur-Athara in 710, Merodach-baladan's forces are said to have included 600 cavalrymen (*pēthallu*) and 4000 garrison soldiers (*šābē šulūti*).¹⁸⁴ In the following year, at the Assyrian siege of Dur-Yakin, Merodach-baladan's capital in the south, Chaldean forces included a central contingent under the king (*kišir šarrūti*) and horses trained for chariot use.¹⁸⁵ Ashurbanipal claimed that he

178. Although there are isolated references to iron in Babylonia in the final centuries of the second millennium, the incidence of iron technology is hardly significant before 900 B.C. at the earliest. General survey: Maddin, Muhly, and Wheeler, *Scientific American* 237/4 (Oct. 1977) 122-131. Note also the increased use of metal in graves at Nippur at this time (McCown and Haines, *OIP* 78 147).

179. Gibson, *OIAR* 1981-82, p. 43.

180. E.g., BM 113926, a seventh-century inventory found by Hall at Ur (*A Season's Work at Ur*, pp. 164-165; *JEA* 9 [1923] 186; see *Or* 38 [1969] 343).

181. NCBT 1093:6.

182. An ironsmith was known in Assyria already in Middle Assyrian times (VAT 9405:16, see Weidner, *Afo* 10 [1935-36] 31, and Donbaz, *JCS* 32 [1980] 212).

183. NCBT 1093:2.

184. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 44.

185. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 60. Note too that the Chaldeans in exile in Commagene (Kummuhu) furnished military units for the local Assyrian administration: chariotry, cavalry, archers, and shield- and lance-bearers (Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, p. 118 [= ARAB 2 §63] and Lie, *Sargon*, p. 72).

had given Shamash-shum-ukin infantry, cavalry, and chariotry,¹⁸⁶ the three major components of contemporary armed forces. Babylonian armies by themselves proved capable of capturing major cities such as Nippur (693) and Cutha (651).¹⁸⁷ Southern Mesopotamians were apparently not devoid of military skills, since the Assyrian army in the time of Ashurbanipal included troops recruited from among Babylonians, Chaldeans, and Arameans;¹⁸⁸ but we have as yet discovered practically no documentation concerning the Babylonian army itself. Although this army in the eighth and seventh centuries was generally not a match for the Assyrian forces and their more advanced techniques, it was able to face the Assyrians in the field and on several occasions to check Assyrian moves.¹⁸⁹

These then are some of the factors in the transformation of Babylonia between 747 and 626 B.C. To what at the beginning of this period had been a sparsely populated, impoverished, and unstable land with rival tribal and traditional groups, Assyrian military intervention and governance meant oppression and limited economic exploitation. But the Assyrian presence aroused local resistance, helped to heal political fragmentation, and led Babylonia to develop regional alliances with Elam and the Arams. A series of political leaders, mostly Chaldean but culminating in the disaffected Assyrian prince Shamash-shum-ukin, organized a series of national and international coalitions to oppose Assyrian encroachment. Although the Babylonian forces inevitably succumbed in each protracted encounter, their perennial struggles revealed Assyrian vulnerability¹⁹⁰ at the height of the Late Assyrian empire. The Babylonian metamorphosis under Assyrian stress was not simply political and military; its social and economic dimensions were also impressive. With the eventual stabilization of the Babylonian monarchy under Assyrian domination, the Babylonian economy showed signs of increasing growth, even after diversion of goods and services for Assyrian use. Babylonian cities prospered financially and—under royal or gubernatorial patronage—also architecturally. The

186. Literally "men, horses, chariots" (Streick, *Asb.*, p. 28).

187. Babylonian Chronicle ii 47; Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle, line 8 (texts in *TCS* 5 78 and 129).

188. *PRT* no. 105; cf. Parker, *Iraq* 23 (1961) 38 ND 2619. See also nn. 106 and 185 above.

189. Although there are grounds for doubting whether Babylonian forces participated in the battle at Der in 720, we know that Assyria suffered at least temporary reverses at the hands of Babylonian troops at Kisib (703, first skirmish), Hahule (691), and probably at Cutha (651), not to mention the numerous setbacks in southern Babylonia for Assyrian allies during the Great Rebellion (652-648).

190. And the inadequacy of imperial bureaucratic methods.

older Babylonian settled population increased in size and, in order to survive in a world dominated by Assyrians and tribesmen, developed broader kin-based groups with a more effective voice than the isolated family unit. The great families of the urban northwest—the Gahal, Egibi, Arka(t)-ilani-damqa—rose to prominence. Babylonia's pluralist population, with its longstanding capacity to absorb heterogeneous newcomers, at length found its language and, to a lesser extent, its culture giving way under growing Aramean influence.

In these decades, the shadow of the Assyrian empire meant compromised independence and a muted political career for Babylonia; but it also meant relative stability, prosperity, and protection from outside foes. In the words of Sargon, subject peoples were advised to enjoy the protective benefits of the *pax assyriaca*:

Eat your bread (and) drink your water (under) the shadow of the king my lord, (and) be glad.¹⁹¹

Under the contrasting conditions of stress and economic growth, political and social institutions in southern Mesopotamia underwent substantial transformation, and Babylonia expanded its international horizons. Although thwarted in attempts to assert its freedom, Babylonia in the course of its struggle created new mechanisms that would—in the two decades after 625 B.C.—not only dispel the Assyrian shadow but eradicate the empire that cast it.

191. NL 39.40-41 (Saggs, *Iraq* 20 [1958] 182-184), newly edited by Postgate, *Iraq* 35 (1972) 22-23 (advice to a local official in Anatolia). For the historical context of the passage, see Hawkins, *CAH* 3/1, 2nd ed., p. 421.

Initial Assyrian Involvement in Babylonia, 747-722 B.C.

Around 750 B.C., the major states of Mesopotamia were beset by debilitating political lassitude. Effective power in both Assyria and Babylonia was segmented among weak monarchs, quasi-independent governors, and aggressive tribal groups. The population of Assyria had suffered from two severe outbreaks of plague in the preceding fifteen years.¹⁹² East of the Tigris, the borderland between the two countries—most of it taken over by Assyria in campaigns in the late ninth century¹⁹³—had gradually fallen away from Assyrian control and had resisted Assyrian attempts to retake it.¹⁹⁴ Chaldean and Aramean tribesmen in northern and eastern Babylonia and in the adjacent frontier regions were posing serious problems for the major states.

Against this general background, Nabonassar came to the throne in Babylonia in 748 or 747,¹⁹⁵ and Tiglath-pileser III acceded in Assyria in

192. In 765 and 759 according to the eponym chronicles (RLA 2 430, 432).

193. For the Babylonian-Assyrian border east of the Tigris at the close of the ninth century, see Reade, "Assyrian Campaigns, 840-811 B.C., and the Babylonian Frontier," *ZA* 68 (1978) 251-260.

194. The breaking away of the borderland in the east took place at approximately the same time as the devolution of the western Assyrian provinces under such independent-minded governors as Bel-harran-bel-usur, Shamshi-ilu, Shamash-resh-usur and his son Ninurta-kudurri-usur. Note the Assyrian campaigns against the borderland particularly between 771 and 767 (against the Itu² tribe and the city of Gannanati) and similar adventures into the neighboring region of Namri, which had also lapsed from Assyrian control. Babylonia itself was invaded on one occasion (Marad, 770); but there is no evidence for Babylonian aggression in the borderlands at this time (for an inference to the contrary, see Grayson in *CAH* 3/2, 2nd ed., chapter 22, forthcoming). For the geography of the eastern regions, see the suggestions of Levine, *Geographical Studies in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros*, and Reade, *Iran* 16 (1978) 137-143 and *ZA* 68 (1978) 251-260.

195. His first official year was 747. His accession year, which would have been 748, is as yet unattested. The reign of Nabonassar is treated in detail in *PKB*, pp. 226-234. Documentary sources: *PKB*, pp. 356-357; *WO* 5/1 (1969) 39-50; *JCS* 35 (1983) 63-64. A portrait said to be of Nabonassar on the stele Ashmolean 1933.1101 (illustrations in Seidl, *Bagh. Mitt.* 4 [1968] pl.

745.¹⁹⁶ Although later ages were to view Nahonassar's accession as a turning point in Babylonian history,¹⁹⁷ it is difficult to discern qualities in Nahonassar or his reign that were epoch-making. Babylonia continued to suffer from weak central government: a local revolt in Borsippa had to be forcibly repressed, and officials in Uruk were obliged to usurp the usually royal prerogative of temple-building and reconstruct an *akitu* shrine that had fallen into disrepair.¹⁹⁸ Although Babylonia was beginning to stabilize economically during this reign (if one can judge from the relative number of economic texts surviving),¹⁹⁹ such stabilization seems to have taken place because Tiglath-pileser was propping up the Babylonian throne against domination by the Chaldeans.

The forceful character of Tiglath-pileser III overshadows all of Mesopotamia at this time. Most likely of non-royal parentage, he had come to the Assyrian throne after a revolt in Calah, the political capital. He quickly brought order to Assyria; and, in three vigorous campaigns in the opening years of his reign (745-743), he moved against bothersome trouble spots of the preceding decades—his southeastern borderlands (extending into trihal areas of Babylonia), Namri, and Urartu—and asserted Assyrian dominance on these fronts. His first campaign (745) concentrated on

32a; Moorey, *Ancient Iraq*, pl. XXIV, Harper, *Iranica Antiqua* 17 [1982] pl. IVa following p. 84) instead belongs to Ashur-nadin-shumi (699-694).

196. This was his accession year, according to the eponym chronicle (RLA 2 430); cf. the restored date in the Babylonian Chronicle i 1 (text in TCS 5 70).

197. The "Ptolemaic Canon" uses a "Nabonassar Era," reckoned as beginning in this king's first year, 747 (C. Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, p. 305); cf. the frequent mention of Nabonassar in Ptolemy's *Almagest*. Such Babylonian documents as the chronicle series and the nineteen-year interval texts also commence their accounts with this reign. Hallo, *BSMS* 6 (1983) 14-18, presents reasons—mostly speculative—for viewing the Nabonassar era as a contemporary innovation.

198. Borsippa: Babylonian Chronicle i 6-8 (text in TCS 5 71); these disruptions were probably extensions of problems in Borsippa during the preceding reign (PKB, p. 226; JAOS 88 [1968] 124-130; CAH 3/1, 2nd ed., pp. 311-312). Uruk: WO 5/1 (1969) 39-50.

199. The correlation between the volume of known economic texts and economic stability or prosperity is at best hypothetical. It involves assumptions that the surviving number of texts is proportional to ancient text volume and that quantity of recorded transactions is an index of growth or decline of economic activity; these assumptions are far from certain. Although numbers of economic texts furnish some of the few long-term statistics available to us at present for the millennium between 1600 and 600 B.C., they should be used with considerable caution; and statements in this monograph about changing economic conditions in Babylonia must be viewed as tentative and based on evidence that is susceptible to various interpretations. For a survey of the pertinent documentary evidence from Babylonian economic texts, see Brinkman and Kennedy, *JCS* 35 (1983) 1-90.

northern and eastern Babylonia.²⁰⁰ In the north he reached the cities of Dur-Kurigalzu and Sippar and perhaps went as far as the vicinity of Nippur;²⁰¹ but his armies did not touch the metropolitan regions near Babylon. In the east he defeated several Aramean tribes, including the Adile, Dunanu, Hamranu, and Rahilu and resettled captives in a newly constructed city named Kar-Ashur.²⁰² In effect, he secured his southern

200. There are serious problems at present in attempting to distinguish in Tiglath-pileser's campaign accounts between at least two major phases or Assyrian activity in Babylonia, namely in 745 and in 731-729. One of the major difficulties is that the long-announced edition by Tadmor of Tiglath-pileser's inscriptions has still not appeared; and Rost's ninety-year-old edition is now both unsatisfactory and incomplete. Consequently, in reconstructing the campaign of 745, one has to rely on a terse entry in the eponym chronicle C^b 1 (*[ina ITI] Tašritu ana birūt nāri ittalak*, RLA 2 430 rev. 28), a short summary in the Babylonian Chronicle i 1-5 (text in TCS 5 70-71), and a damaged and undated section of Tiglath-pileser's annals (Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, pl. XI = ARAB 1 §§762-764); previous use of Nimrud Slab no. 1 for such reconstruction has now been eloquently challenged by Tadmor (*AnSt* 33 [1983] 199-203). Tadmor in this article presents arguments—based in part on an unpublished text—that Nimrud Slab no. 1 should be dated "probably after the siege of Shapiya in 731 (= 15th *palā*), with 729 (17th *palā*) as the *terminus ad quem*."

Tadmor's evidence, however, is insufficient to prove his contention unless one is willing to accept his unspoken premise that the summary mention of Bit-Amukani in Nimrud Slab no. 1.11 must refer to the Assyrian campaign beginning in 731 (otherwise, in line with his arguments, nothing else in the text has been shown to date after 735). It is not clear that Tiglath-pileser's involvement with Bit-Amukani in 731 had to be his first encounter with that tribe. The substantial differences in content between the two accounts dealing with a campaign or campaigns in Babylonia as preserved in Nimrud Slab no. 1 (Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, pls. XXXII-XXXIII = ARAB 1 §§780-785) and in Nimrud Tablet no. 1 (2 R 67 = ARAB 1 §§787-804) do not seem to be simply a function of narrative length; and one must attempt to explain *inter alia* the variations in royal titulary, in the names and locations of the Aramean tribes, and in the description of the events in Bit-Amukani (and especially the relation of occurrences touching on Shapiya—as compared with the broad treatment of the considerably less important Bit-Shaluni in both accounts). It seems likely that some of these divergences will have chronological significance, and the matter deserves closer examination.

Pending the appearance of Tadmor's text edition and the resolution of uncertainties surrounding the date of Nimrud Slab no. 1, I have omitted events mentioned only in Nimrud Slab no. 1 from the narrative in these pages. Compare n. 203 below.

201. Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, pl. XI 5 (URU BÂD-gal-zi URU Si-par ša Ša-maš), 7 (KUR Qi-in-EN.LÍL.KI); note the similarities in Nimrud Slab no. 1:4-5 (URU BÂD-Ku-ri-gal-zi URU Sip-par ša UTU . . . a-di EN.LÍL.KI).

202. Rost, *Tiglat-Pileser*, pl. XI 4, 6-7 (annals, name of [LÚ a-di]-li-e partially restored); Babylonian Chronicle i 4 (text in TCS 5 71). Tadmor would add to the list of tribes the Iltu' and Rubu' based on his interpretation of Nimrud Slab no. 1:4-7 (*AnSt* 33 [1983] 203 n. 21).

flank and neutralized troublesome Aramean areas in Nabonassar's realm.²⁰³

Tiglath-pileser after 745 turned his attention elsewhere and left the Babylonians to shift for themselves. Nabonassar, though not a strong ruler, managed to hold the throne for fourteen years and, at his death in 734, to pass his kingdom on to his son Nabu-nadin-zeri.²⁰⁴ In the latter's second regnal year (732), a Babylonian provincial official deposed him and took the throne as Nabu-shuma-ukin II.²⁰⁵ The new king ruled for just over a month before being displaced by a Chaldean, Mukin-zeri (731-729), chief of the tribe of Bit-Amukani.²⁰⁶

In 732, the year of the Babylonian revolts, Tiglath-pileser was off campaigning in Syria. He reacted quickly to the presence of a Chaldean on the Babylonian throne, returned to Assyria, and over the next three years concentrated his military and diplomatic skill on removing Mukin-zeri. He dispatched an envoy to Babylon in an attempt to convince its citizens to reject the Chaldean and to support the Assyrian side. He had retained the loyalties of some Aramean tribes and of a few Babylonian cities such as Dilbat and Nippur. The Chaldeans, on the other hand, failed to maintain a united front and engaged in petty intrigues. In a show of force, Tiglath-pileser went south, campaigned against Bit-Amukani and Bit-Sha'alli, and effectively confined Mukin-zeri to his local capital, Shapiya; this induced other Chaldean chieftains to submit and pay substantial tribute. The description of this payment, in contrast to most prosaic booty lists recorded by Tiglath-pileser's scribes, shows the wealth of the Chaldean

203. It remains uncertain whether Tiglath-pileser's assumption of the title "King of Sumer and Akkad" and his first contacts with the Bit-Shilani, Bit-Amukani, Itur, Lita'u, Puqudu, Rubu', and Ru'ua may be dated before 731. The chronology of these at present depends too much on the dating of Nimrud Slab no. 1 (see n. 200 above). It may be noted that the scribal correction in Nimrud Slab no. 1:4 (with *ul-tu* over an effaced *a-di*) need not be regarded either as a mistake or as indicating that the text is incomplete (pace Tadmor, *AnSt* 33 [1983] 202), the phrase as it stands makes perfectly good syntactical sense ("since the beginning of my reign") and it need hardly be emended so that it can parallel the introductory sections of Tiglath-pileser's later texts.

204. This is the only instance of father-son succession to the Babylonian throne among non-Assyrians between 810 and 625 B.C. For the reign of Nabu-nadin-zeri (Nadinu), see *PKB*, pp. 234-235 and 357.

205. For the reign of Nabu-shuma-ukin II, see *PKB*, pp. 235 and 357-358.

206. A longer form of his name may be Nabu-mukin-zeri (*PKB*, p. 235 n. 1492). For the reign of this king, see *PKB*, pp. 235-240 and 358-359 (with further comment in *JCS* 35 [1983] 65).

leaders and particularly of Merodach-baladan of Bit-Yakin, who is given prominence by the title "King of the Sealand" in the Assyrian account. Merodach-baladan, though now portrayed as submissive, was to prove the main antagonist of the Assyrians in Babylonia in the decades after 722 B.C.²⁰⁷

After the containment of Mukin-zeri and the neutralization of the tribesmen,²⁰⁸ Tiglath-pileser himself ascended the Babylonian throne.²⁰⁹ This personal assumption of the dual Assyro-Babylonian monarchy was to set a precedent for his successors over the next century. The arrangement had the advantage of preserving a nominal independence for Babylonia rather than simply relegating it to vassal status. Tiglath-pileser personally participated in the preeminent rite of the Babylonian monarchy and escorted the statue of the god Marduk in the New Year's procession at Babylon. He also weakened potential local opposition by deporting numerous Chaldeans from the conquered areas.

After Tiglath-pileser's death in 727, his son Shalmaneser V succeeded to the dual monarchy and reigned for five years.²¹⁰ His reign is poorly documented, and the only known major activity relating to Babylonia is his deportation of Chaldeans from Bit-Adini (probably a section of Bit-Dakkuri).²¹¹

These twenty-five years, 747-722, witnessed the initial involvement of the nascent Late Assyrian empire in securing its southern flank in and around Babylonia. At first Tiglath-pileser invaded only to pacify Aramean

207. Documentation for Tiglath-pileser's campaigns in Babylonia during the years 731-729 may be found in *PKB*, pp. 236-240.

208. A defeat of Mukin-zeri is graphically described in NL 65 (text in *Iraq* 25 [1963] 71-73 and plate XI). Assyrian forces also had to subdue the Puqudu and the eastern border regions (*PKB*, p. 240); some of these areas, including the city of Lahiru, were annexed to Assyria and put under the jurisdiction of the governor of Arrapha.

209. Tiglath-pileser was the king's official name in both Assyria and Babylonia. Later non-Assyrian texts occasionally refer to him by a shorter form Pulu or Pul. Documentation for the names: *PKB*, pp. 240-241 n. 1544. Sources for the reign: *PKB*, pp. 240-243 and 359-360.

210. Shalmaneser was occasionally referred to by the hypocoristic name Ululayu, but mostly in informal or later texts. Documentation for the name: *PKB*, pp. 243-244 nn. 1560 and 1564.

211. A supposed reference to Shalmaneser V in a letter mentioning Babylon (*CT* 54 66, as proposed by Dietrich in *WO* 4 [1967-68] 68) is based on an almost complete restoration of the name and is too tenuous to be accepted here. Sources for the reign are discussed in *PKB*, pp. 243-245, 360, see also W. Schramm, *Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften* 2140, and Brinkman, *JCS* 29 (1977) 62 and *JCS* 35 (1963) 65 AK.1.

and Chaldean triehsmen; and, though claiming nominal suzerainty, he left the Bahylonian king undisturbed. Later, when confronted by the prospect of a Chaldean on the Bahylonian throne, he campaigned more extensively and eventually assumed personal control of the Bahylonian monarchy. The Assyrians also attempted to avert future troubles in the south by deporting or resettling substantial numbers of triehsmen.

PART III

The Chaldean Struggle for Independence, 721-689 B.C.

The Assyrian hold on Bahylonia proved to be ephemeral, ceasing after the death of Shalmaneser V in 722 (when the Assyrians became preoccupied with a power struggle in their own land). Although the sequence of events at this juncture must be reconstructed from scattered and often ambiguous clues, it appears that Shalmaneser lost his throne as the result of a revolution; and the emergent monarch proved to be a usurper from outside the direct line of succession who took the wishful but assertive throne name Sargon (Assyrian *Šarru-kēnu*, "legitimate king").²¹² While Sargon was consolidating his power in Assyria, Merodach-baladan, a Chaldean who had paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser in 729, took the opportunity to make himself king of Bahylonia. Thus began a period of three decades in which Chaldeans and Assyrians were to struggle for control over the Bahylonian throne.

To place in perspective the history of Bahylonia during these years, it is important to consider the political situation in southwest Asia as a whole. Under Sargon and Sennacherib, the military apparatus of the Neo-Assyrian empire overshadowed the whole of the Fertile Crescent from Palestine in the southwest to Bahylonia in the southeast. The Assyrians either controlled or actively meddled in the government of each significant polity in this zone. In greater Syria, they put an end to the last of the Neo-Hittite states east of the Taurus (Kummuhu). In Palestine, they deported the inhabitants of Samaria and later reduced Judah and its neighbor kingdoms to the status of tribute-paying vassals. Assyrian armed forces campaigned in the mountains and plains on the outer rim of the Crescent: Anatolia, Urartu, the Zagros highlands, and Elam. In pointed contrast to the general pattern of military successes throughout the core of this area were the perennial troubles at the southeast end of the Crescent, where a

212. This is the traditional meaning of the name, though variant writings in Sargon's royal inscriptions reflect more than one scribal tradition and interpretation of the name's signification.

recalcitrant Babylonia resisted Assyrian encroachment with frequent assistance from its neighbor Elam.²¹³

The three decades from 721 to 689 marked a turning point for both Babylonia and Assyria. Although the Assyrian empire was still expanding through the unrivalled power of its armies, Babylonia was quick to take advantage of perceived imperial weaknesses: excessive dependence on the person of the monarch and insufficient local deployment of troops to enforce the allegiance of subject populations. The removal of Shalmaneser V by revolution (722) and the death of Sargon II in battle (705) showed the Assyrian imperial structure as vulnerable at the apex, despite its vast territories. In addition, after Assyria had installed vassal kings in Babylonia,²¹⁴ it did not provide adequate regional forces to give these rulers firm control of their territory and their throne. The Chaldeans in particular took advantage of opportunities provided unwittingly by Assyria, and on several occasions their tribal leaders took over the Babylonian monarchy. The older, non-tribal population of Babylonia actively joined the anti-Assyrian opposition, particularly after the accession of Sennacherib; they twice revolted (703, 694) and put their own nominees on the throne. But overall the Chaldeans orchestrated the struggle against Assyria; their tribes united behind a single leader and gradually built up a wider base of support consisting of most Arameans, the majority of Babylonian urbanites, and Elamite and Arab allies. As time went on and local resistance grew stronger, Assyria found itself channeling more and more of its military resources against its southern neighbor. As will be seen below, this crystallization of opposition in Assyria and Babylonia took place over thirty years with widespread consequences for both countries.

Merodach-baladan, the new Chaldean king of Babylonia in 721, was a worthy protagonist for the Late Assyrian empire.²¹⁵ As chief of Bit-Yakin, the most prestigious and wealthy of the Chaldean tribes, he controlled extensive territories along the southeast course of the lower Euphrates—

213. Anatolia and especially Tabal were also troublesome areas, but on the northwest fringes of the empire—thus more remote and generally of less concern than Babylonia. See Hawkins, *CAH* 3/1, 2nd ed., pp. 416-422.

214. Bel-ibni (702-700) and Ashur-nadin-shumi (699-694).

215. Sources for the reign of Merodach-baladan II are discussed by Leemans, *JEOL* 10 (1945-48) 432-455; Brinkman, *Studies Oppenheim*, pp. 6-53; Brinkman and Kennedy, *JCS* 35 (1983) 8-13. Note the portrayal of the king, along with the governor of Babylon, Bel-ahhe-eriba, on the top of the kudurru VA 2663 (*ANEP* no. 454).

terrain of strategic importance as well as the source of significant revenue from trade routes. In addition he demonstrated considerable personal skill as a political leader and diplomat. He managed to weld together the usually discordant Aramean and Chaldean tribes into a united anti-Assyrian front and to retain their loyalty despite military reverses. He gradually reached outside Babylonia to both east and west to combine or coordinate efforts with strong anti-Assyrian movements in Elam, northern Arabia, and Judah. Many of the older Babylonians in urban centers eventually found him acceptable as monarch, and their attachment may have been influenced by his lineage: his ascendant Eriba-Marduk had occupied the Babylonian throne with distinction some decades earlier and had earned a reputation for fair dealing with his non-tribal subjects.²¹⁶

There are, however, major source problems in reconstructing Merodach-baladan's political career. Most pertinent texts are Assyrian; and, in addition to the customary propagandistic distortion of their narratives, they express an unwonted degree of personal vituperation against Merodach-baladan, perhaps because he for so long managed to frustrate Assyrian punitive expeditions. Sargon's scribes in particular took great pains to portray Merodach-baladan as an outsider: a Chaldean who occupied the Babylonian throne against the will of the gods, an illegitimate monarch rejected by the religious elite of his capital, and an oppressor who maltreated the non-tribal population by taking hostages from the major cities of the north and by removing divine statues from the cult centers of the south.²¹⁷ In part, of course, Merodach-baladan was set up in these inscriptions as an elaborate literary foil for Sargon himself, who was praised as fulfilling the divine will and championing the political and religious rights of venerable Babylonian temples and cities. By contrast, the few contemporary Babylonian royal sources paint a different picture: Merodach-baladan, as eldest son of the earlier great monarch Eriba-Marduk, dutifully revered the shrines built by his remote royal predecessors;²¹⁸ he expelled the "wicked enemy, the Subarian" (i.e., the Assyrians) from Babylonia; he preserved and extended the ancient

216. Merodach-baladan claimed to be the eldest son of Eriba-Marduk; but, since his career extended for at least sixty years after the end of Eriba-Marduk's reign, it is possible that he was the latter's grandson (*Studies Oppenheim*, p. 9 n. 15 and pp. 29-30; cf. W.G. Lambert in Garelli, ed., *Palais*, pp. 431-432). The rule of Eriba-Marduk is discussed in *PKB*, pp. 221-224.

217. E.g., Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 40-64; cf. *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 13.

218. Shulgi and Anam (*Iraq* 15 [1953] 133-3-4).

privileges of the major cult cities of Bahylonia.²¹⁹ These self-serving claims and counterclaims of partisan royal inscriptions, both Babylonian and Assyrian, have to be viewed critically; and due weight must be placed on independent evidence of a more prosaic type—particularly legal and administrative documents—which indicates that Bahylonia and its economy prospered under Merodach-baladan.²²⁰ Keeping in mind these parameters, we may attempt a diachronic perspective of Merodach-baladan's career.

After Shalmaneser's death in 722, Bahylonia and Assyria drifted apart under the separate governments of their new rulers. Assyria was preoccupied by internal troubles in 721,²²¹ and the first contact between the two countries came only in the following year when the Assyrian garrison at Der was attacked as the result of a joint Babylonian-Elamite initiative. The ancient town of Der, near modern Badrah in eastern Iraq,²²² was in former Babylonian territory that had been annexed by Assyria; it lay at the northern end of the principal access road to Elam. The city was to have been assaulted by the combined forces of Bahylonia and Elam; and its capture would have meant for Bahylonia the regaining of an old possession and for Elam enhanced protection from Assyrian aggression. The Babylonian forces of Merodach-baladan were delayed, so the Elamites under their king Humban-nikash I (Ummanigash) invaded the area by themselves and fought the Assyrians in a plain outside the city. The immediate result of the battle was a stalemate; the Elamites hested the Assyrian army in the field and gained territory south of Der,²²³ but the Assyrians retained control of the city. The aftermath, however, was significant: the Assyrians directed their military attentions elsewhere, and

219. Gadd, *Iraq* 15 (1953) 133-134; VAS 1 37.

220. *Studies Oppenheim*, pp. 15-18. Cf. now *JCS* 35 (1983) 8-13.

221. Sargon did not campaign in 721, although his scribes later attempted to fill the lacuna in their lists (Tadmor, *JCS* 12 [1958] 37-38 and 94).

222. Sidney Smith, *JEA* 18 (1932) 28-29. For other literature, see Nashef, *RGTC* 5 79.

223. Sennacherib later recorded that the settlements of Bit-Ha'iri and Rasa (*Rasā*) had been lost to Elam in the reign of his father (*OIP* 2 39; *AfO* 20 [1963] 90). For a proposed reconstruction of the Assyro-Babylonian frontier at this time, see Reade, *Iran* 16 (1978) 140 fig. 2. Levine, *JCS* 34 (1982) 51 n. 70, sees the Elamite gain on this occasion as slight and views the episode at Der as a setback to Elam as an "expansionist state"; the latter assertion does not fit what is known of Elamite history in the eighth and seventh centuries (although in this instance it was on the offensive), and the former interpretation is only one of several possible (it took the Assyrians almost thirty years before they could regain the territory).

the Bahylonians and Elamites were left undisturbed for a full ten years.²²⁴

This decade free from Assyrian interference allowed Babylonia to prosper, even with a Chaldean on the throne.²²⁵ Merodach-baladan, despite his tribal background, seems to have conscientiously performed the duties of a Babylonian monarch. He repaired and endowed temples for the traditional gods of Mesopotamia;²²⁶ he acknowledged the tax-exemption privileges of the citizens of the old sacred cities such as Babylon, Borsippa, and Sippar. He kept provincial administration functioning and saw to the maintenance of canals, irrigation systems, and bridges;²²⁷ one of the major waterways near Uruk came to bear his name.²²⁸ The legal and administrative documents surviving from his time show a significant rise in the number of economic transactions, reaching the highest level in five centuries.²²⁹ There is also evidence for cultural and scientific activity. Merodach-baladan's scribes wrote passable Sumerian as well as Akkadian, and some of his royal inscriptions have decided literary overtones.²³⁰ Later traditions mention a garden (*gannatu*) of Merodach-baladan filled with exotic plants and formal records being kept of astronomical observations during his reign. The impression gained from contemporary and later documentation is hardly that of a tribal interloper

224. *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 13; *JNES* 24 (1965) 161-162; Grayson, *AS* 16 340-342.

225. Most statements in this paragraph are documented in *Studies Oppenheim*, pp. 15-18, 37, 48-49.

226. Particularly well known is his work on the Ningishzida temple at Uruk (Gadd, *Iraq* 15 [1953] 123-134; Lenzen, *Iraq* 19 [1957] 146-150; Follet, *Biblica* 35 [1954] 413-428). He was also responsible for significant reconstruction of the Ur-Nammu ziggurat at Uruk (*UVB* 8 15, 25; *UVB* 11 12; *UVB* 12-13 16).

227. A text from Kish dated in 656 B.C. also mentions a land division or redistribution (*zu'u'zutu*) undertaken during the reign of Merodach-baladan (BM 46799+2-3).

228. Re-edition of the bridge text: Walker, *CBI* no. 75; see also Dalley, *RA* 74 (1980) 189-190. Uruk waterway (*Id harri ša Marduk-apla-iddina*): *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 17 and n. 89; cf. *UVB* 12-13 14.

229. At present we have 3.25 documents per year for the years 721-710 in Babylonia (*JCS* 35 [1983] 8-13), although this figure is skewed by the exceptional number of texts which Durand has interpreted as dockets for packets of wool (*JA* 267 [1979] 245-260). The preceding quarter century (747-722) has 1.12 texts per year. To reach a significantly higher density of economic texts, one would have to go back to the reign of Kashtiliashu IV in the thirteenth century (when there was an average of more than fifteen texts per year).

230. Compare the literary style of the Merodach-baladan cylinder (*Iraq* 15 [1953] 123-134) and the Berlin kudurru prologue (VAS 1 37). K.R. Veenhof has pointed out privately the quotation from the Erra Epic (v 35) in line 34 of the cylinder.

alternately terrorizing or neglecting the urban populations, as Sargon's inscriptions would have us believe.

In the year 710 the picture changed abruptly. Sargon, who for a decade had been campaigning extensively in the western and northern portions of the Fertile Crescent, turned his attention to the southeast.²³¹ His decision was to prove fateful for both Assyria and Babylonia and to have effects that lasted well beyond the term of his own reign. Babylonia became engaged in a determined struggle to preserve its independence, a struggle which in its early phases was dominated almost exclusively by Chaldean leaders and relied heavily on Elamite support. Assyria found itself gradually absorbed in a series of often protracted campaigns which consumed a disproportionate amount of her military and economic energy; between 710 and 678, from the twelfth year of Sargon until well into the reign of his grandson Esarhaddon, most major Assyrian campaigns were directed at Babylonia or her immediate neighbors.²³² It is significant that the Assyrian empire almost at its apogee proved unable to cope decisively with militarily inferior forces who were relatively nearby. One of the reasons for Chaldean and Elamite successes—however ephemeral—was that these peoples were capable of exercising a resilient, environmentally based defense, since they were able to withdraw into swamps and rugged highlands in which regular Assyrian forces could not be deployed to advantage.

In 710 Sargon forestalled the Babylonian-Elamite coalition that had engineered the Assyrian defeat ten years earlier.²³³ In an astute tactical move, he sent his principal fighting forces along the eastern frontier of Babylonia to drive a wedge between the erstwhile allies. He himself set up headquarters at Kish in northern Babylonia and received the submission of

231. Sargon's epistolary archives preserve intelligence reports from this time or a little earlier in Babylonia, e.g., letters from Ashur-beli-taqin and Ilu-yada' (*ABL* 502-504, *CT* 53 64, 68, etc.). Most of these are too fragmentary to be of much use for political reconstruction. For the Assyrian side of this corpus, see Parpola, *ARIN*, pp. 117-142; for the Babylonian, see the preliminary remarks by Dietrich, *WO* 4 (1967-68) 61-98, 187-191.

232. Notably the campaigns of 710-709 (with anti-Chaldean action in Babylonia continuing down at least into 707), 703-702, 700, 694-693, 691, 690-689, and 680, with further action of undetermined scope in 678, 675, and 674 (and possibly in 679 and 677).

233. The Assyrian eponym chronicle records the campaign of 710 as directed against Bit-Zeri (reading uncertain, written URUE = NUMUN-i/I in *RLA* 2 433, cf. *ABL* 502 rev. 11). One would have expected the primary object of this campaign to have been Merodach-baladan, but there is no obvious connection between this designation and the Yakin leader. Further study is needed.

cities such as Nippur.²³⁴ Merodach-baladan did not attempt to defend the Babylonian urban centers, but instead made his stand at fortified sites on the trihal periphery, first (710) in the east at Dur-Athara among the Gamhulu (the principal Aramean group in the region) and then (709) in the south at Dur-Yakin, his own native capital among the Chaldeans. On each occasion he relied on limited contingents of his own troops, allied forces (mainly Aramean), and a defensive strategy that included extensive flooding of the surrounding terrain.²³⁵

The Assyrian campaigns were successful in that they effectively deprived Merodach-baladan of his trihal base and intimidated the untried Elamite monarch, Shutur-Nahhunte, from offering assistance to the Chaldeans.²³⁶ The capture of Dur-Athara and the ensuing mop-up operations neutralized most of the major Aramean tribes in eastern Babylonia by the end of 710. Before the next campaign commenced early in the following year, several major developments had taken place. Sargon brought most of his troops into Bit-Dakkuri, just south of Babylon.²³⁷ Merodach-baladan fled the capital by night; and Babylon and Borsippa then submitted to Sargon,²³⁸ who formally ascended the Babylonian throne. Merodach-baladan requested asylum in Elam from Shutur-Nahhunte, but the latter forbade him to enter the country.²³⁹ Shutur-Nahhunte himself withdrew to the highlands and tried to escape being drawn into the conflict. Without Elamite support, Merodach-baladan was constrained to make a stand in 709 at his trihal capital of Dur-Yakin, where

234. *RLA* 2 433 (headquarters at Kish). An economic text from Nippur (2 NT 280 = IM 57900) is dated 'VI'-29-'accession year' of Sargon, i.e., 710 B.C.

235. A relief showing the amphibious character of Sargon's campaigns in the south around this time may be found in Loud, *OIP* 38 60 fig. 72.

236. Shutur-Nahhunte (known as Ishtar-hundu in the Babylonian Chronicle) had succeeded Humban-nikash as king in 717 and had not yet faced the Assyrians on the battlefield. He has often been identified with Shutruk-Nahhunte (II), whose inscriptions are published in *A/O Beiheft* 16 146-149, though this identification has recently been called into question (de Miroschedji, *RA* 76 [1982] 61-62); Stolper, "Political History," p. 45 and pp. 92-93 n. 364, with bibliography.

237. His headquarters were set up in the ruined city of Dur-Ladini, which he rebuilt (Lie, *Sargon*, p. 54:7-8).

238. Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 54-56.

239. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 54; revised translation in *JNES* 24 (1965) 163.

he was soon defeated in the countryside and eventually forced to yield the town itself.²⁴⁰

After Sargon had won Babylonia, he took decisive steps to consolidate his conquest. He centralized the myriad small centers of provincial and tribal government by placing them under the jurisdiction of two principal governors, one stationed in the eastern region of Gambulu and the other in the west at Babylon.²⁴¹ In the tribal areas, according to his official accounts, Sargon resorted to wholesale relocation of populations: more than 108,000 Arameans and Chaldeans were deported into various sections of western Asia.²⁴² In return, Sargon later brought many people from Commagene (Kummuhu) to be settled in southern Babylonia. He also transformed the towns that had been centers of tribal resistance. The Aramean stronghold of Dur-Athara he turned into an Assyrian fortification and renamed Dur-Nabu.²⁴³ Dur-Yakin, Merodach-baladan's local capital, he despoiled and then destroyed in 707.²⁴⁴ Sargon remained in Babylonia almost

240. For the sequence of events in Sargon's last campaigns against the Chaldeans, see van der Spek, *JEOL* 25 (1977-78) 56-66. The location of Dur-Yakin proposed by Saggs, *Sumer* 13 (1957) 192-194, has been contested by Jacobsen, *Iraq* 22 (1960) 183, and Röllig, *RLA* 5 621. Regarding the nature and size of Merodach-baladan's defense works at Dur-Yakin, see Powell, *JCS* 34 (1982) 59-61; one should compare the traces southeast of Ur which involve the cutting/diversion of the Euphrates channel possibly for military-defensive purposes (the description of the topography has been given by Wright in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, pp. 333-334, the date of the diversion is in the post-Kassite range, c. 1150-625, broadly speaking). The coincidence deserves further investigation.

241. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 66:1; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 44-46:283-284, 48-50:330-331, 50-52:14-15. Note too Parpola's conclusions from the Assyrian correspondence concerning the upper echelons of Sargon's personnel in Babylonia (as set forth in *ARINH*, pp. 135-142).

242. Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 44 and 62; cf. van der Spek, *JEOL* 25 (1977-78) 61-62. For deportees to the Harran area from the tribal region of Gambulu, see Johns, *Doomsday Book*, no. 5 ii 26, no. 6 viii 4 (= Fales, *Censimenti*, no. 21 ii 27, no. 5 vii 4); note that Parpola, *ZA* 64 (1975) 108, suggests that these texts date toward the end of the reign of Sargon (or in the reign of Sennacherib). Cf. Postgate, *Iraq* 35 (1973) 29, for possible deportees to Cilicia (Que) from Babylonian cities. The deportation of people from Babylon and Cutha to Samaria (2 Kings 17:24) may also have taken place about this time; compare Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, IX.xiv.3. For the overall scale of Assyrian deportations from Babylonia between 745 and 702, see the provisional remarks in *Power and Propaganda*, p. 227; the Assyrian figures are doubtless exaggerated, though probably not to the extent estimated by Olmstead, *AJSL* 37 (1920-21) 227 (where "50,400" is interpreted simply as "400").

243. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 44.

244. Van der Spek, *JEOL* 25 (1977-78) 56-66.

continuously from 710 to 707 and supervised these operations from close at hand.²⁴⁵

Sargon's inscriptions give an official, idealized account of his relations with the non-tribal population of Babylonia. Even before the conclusion of his campaigns against Merodach-baladan, leading citizens of Babylon and Borsippa—including high temple officials and scribes—had come to Sargon's camp, offered him remnants from cultic meals (a perquisite of Babylonian royalty), and invited him to enter the capital. Sargon accepted the invitation and assumed the responsibilities of the Babylonian monarchy. He participated as king in the New Year's rites at Babylon, presented lavish gifts to Babylonian temples,²⁴⁶ and added Babylonian royal titles to his official titulary. He remedied specific problems caused by Merodach-baladan's abuse or neglect: he released urban hostages, restored purloined statues of deities, and extended tax-exemption privileges to major southern cities (notably Ur, Uruk, Eridu, Larsa, Kissik, and Nemed-Laguda).²⁴⁷ He turned his attention to the neglected countryside of northwest Babylonia, which one of his more colorful inscriptions depicts as having lapsed from cultivation, with settlements in ruin and roads impassable, overgrown with dense underbrush, and infested with wild beasts—an abandoned area inhabited only by Arameans and Sutiens, tent dwellers who preyed on travellers.²⁴⁸ Sargon cut down trees, burned underbrush, slew both wild beasts and Arameans, and resettled the region with captives from other lands. He put a stop to Aramean raids on caravans in the vicinity of Sippar.²⁴⁹ He reopened the old Babylon-Borsippa canal and sponsored extensive construction in the Eanna precinct at Uruk (though in the latter case he may in part have been taking credit for work done by Merodach-baladan).²⁵⁰ Thus Sargon's texts

245. Tribute was delivered to him in Babylon during this time (Lie, *Sargon*, p. 70:466).

246. Note especially the list of precious metals and other gifts in Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, pp. 124-126 (= *ARAB* 2 §70).

247. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 64.

248. *Iraq* 16 (1954) 192. Read at the end of vii 46: *ma-ba-zi* 'EN LIL 'DINGIR' MES 'AMAR.UTU], "cult center of [Marduk], the Enlil of the go[ds]."

249. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 56; *ABL* 88 mentions an Arab raid on Sippar itself.

250. Lie, *Sargon*, p. 56 (cf. *ABL* 1214); *YOS* 1 38; *UVB* 1 55-56; see also Follet, *Biblica* 35 (1954) 413-428. Cf. Lenzen, *Iraq* 19 (1957) 148-149; *UVB* 8 25-26; *UVB* 11 12, 19; *UVB* 12-13 16; *UVB* 14 16, note also Sargon's gift of Puqudu tribesmen as *širkātu* to the temples of Uruk (*BIN* 2 132:3-4). Sargon was also responsible for construction at Kish (Uhairim), according to de Cenouillac (*RA* 10 [1913] 83-87), although the bricks used in this work bore inscriptions

claimed that he had significantly improved the lot of the non-tribal Babylonians, and the five years of his reign in lower Mesopotamia (709-705) seem in fact to have been free from major disorders.²⁵¹

Babylonian relations with Assyria underwent substantial readjustment after 705 B.C., when Sargon lost his life on campaign.²⁵² In the late eighth and seventh centuries, much of Assyrian policy toward Babylonia seems to have been determined personally by the Assyrian monarch; and a new king often meant radical change in direction. Sennacherib in particular seems to have been anxious to distance himself from his father. His attitude was probably conditioned by the inauspicious death of the otherwise successful Sargon; a text of Sennacherib inquires what crime his father had committed to merit such an end.²⁵³ Sennacherib took care to chart new courses: he shifted the seat of government from the recently inaugurated capital of Dur-Sharruken (which his father had built) south to the old city of Nineveh;²⁵⁴ contrary to the long-standing Assyrian royal custom of genealogical citation, he did not mention his father's name in his inscriptions; and he did not authorize the incorporation of Babylonian

relating only to Babylon (for a different interpretation, see Moorey, *Kish Excavations*, p. 178). He also had work done at Babylon on the quay and on the inner and outer city walls (RA 10 [1913] 83-85; Wetzel, WDOG 4879; Koldewey, *Das wieder erstehende Babylon*, 4th ed., pp. 135-136). For the possibility that Sargon was responsible for building activity at Isin, see the comments of Walker and Wilcke in Hrouda, ed., *Isin-Isān Baḥrīyāt* 2 102.

251. With the possible exception of lingering Chaldean resistance in Bit-Yakin. There is also no trace in Babylonia of the outbreak of plague which affected Assyria in 707 (Babylonian Chronicle ii 5'; text in TCS 5 76). For economic documents from Babylonia dated under Sargon, see JCS 35 (1983) 13.

252. RLA 2 435. For the problems in determining where Sargon died, see Tadmor, JCS 12 (1958) 97 (for Tabal) and Parpola, LAS 2 235 (preferring "a battle against the Medes"); cf. the recent synthesis by Hawkins, CAH 3/1, 2nd ed., p. 422. The matter has yet to be satisfactorily determined, since the pertinent passages in the eponym chronicle C^o 6 and in the Babylonian Chronicle must be substantially restored.

253. Tadmor, *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958) 150-163.

254. It should be noted that Dur-Sharruken was not abandoned at this time, but continued to be inhabited until the final days of the Late Assyrian empire. Governors of the city are attested as eponyms in the seventh century, and economic texts found there in 1932 by the Oriental Institute expedition date from the final years of the empire: DŠ 32-49 from VI-20-eponymy of Sin-alik-pani, DŠ 32-43 and DŠ 32-50 from [month and day destroyed]-eponymy of Shamash-sharru-ibni (these eponymies are dated to 615 and 613 B.C. respectively in Falkner's reconstruction of the post-canonical eponyms in A/O 17 [1954-56] 120; the theophoric element is destroyed in the eponym in DŠ 32-50).

royal titles into his titulary.²⁵⁵ To judge from the royal inscriptions of Sargon and Sennacherib, whereas the father had courted Babylonian favor and asked in signs of acceptance, there is little indication that Sennacherib valued Babylonian opinion or that he ever performed the minimum ceremonial duties required of a Babylonian monarch.²⁵⁶

Did Sennacherib have to content with a revolt or unsettled conditions in Assyria or Babylonia at the beginning of his kingship (705-704)? This has sometimes been inferred because various texts from later in his reign indicate conflicting dates (705, 704, or 703) for his first regnal year.²⁵⁷ It is possible to explain these discrepancies in dating by presuming political upheaval or contested succession to the throne; but it is also conceivable that Assyrian scribes did not always achieve precision when calculating according to the varying calendrical systems then in use.²⁵⁸ (Sargon's scribes made similar mistakes in calculation.)²⁵⁹ At present, there is no clear evidence for political unrest in Assyria or Babylonia in 705 or 704, even though such unrest often attended a monarch's unexpected demise.²⁶⁰

255. This is in pointed contrast to the practice of Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon, and Esarhaddon, all of whom adopted Babylonian royal titles. But it must be remembered that current evidence on this point may not be balanced, since most of Sennacherib's texts date from the years 702-690 (689), when he was not in fact king of Babylonia.

256. This conclusion is based on negative evidence and comparison with Sargon; for contrastive purposes, there is an ample number of royal inscriptions surviving from these two rulers.

257. The texts in question have double dates, cited according to both the Assyrian and Babylonian methods of reckoning, i.e., by eponymy as well as numbered regnal year; and the dates according to the two systems do not always coincide (they are frequently one year off). See J. Lewy, *AnOr* 12 225-231; *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 22 and n. 120.

258. There were other experiments in calendrical reckoning at this time, such as the introduction of a variant system of month names which had previously been used chiefly in Elam (see Reiner, *A/O* 24 [1973] 97-102). Note that Sennacherib's scribes used such "Elamite" month names especially in texts composed earlier in his reign, e.g., the Bellino Cylinder (KB 2 114) and BM 123412.

259. ND 1120 (dated in the eponymy of Ishtar-duri, which may be equated with the ninth [year]—rather than the eighth—of Sargon); published by D. J. Wiseman, *Iraq* 14 (1952) pl. XXIII and G. van Driel, *The Cult of Aššur* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1969), pp. 199-205 (reference to this date courtesy of J. Scurlock). There may be similar confusion between year 0 and year 1 in the royal inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon II, and Esarhaddon; but the subject requires further clarification.

260. Hawkins, *CAH* 3/1, 2nd ed., p. 426, deals with possible disturbances in the northwest

Sennacherib's political relations with Babylonia seem to have had predominantly military overtones. Our knowledge is of course conditioned by the nature of the source material, which consists principally of formal royal inscriptions composed by Sennacherib's scribes.²⁶¹ As regards Babylonia, these inscriptions focus on Assyrian military efforts to cope with the perennial widespread resistance to Assyrian rule. There is one notable exception that shows Sennacherib in an unaccustomed light as benefactor of Babylonia; this is the text on the splendid breccia pavement that he installed on the central Processional Street (*Ay-ibur-shabu*) in Babylon.²⁶² Sennacherib tried various modes of governance in southern Mesopotamia; at different times he himself, his crown prince (Ashur-nadin-shumi), and a native Babylonian (Bel-ihni) ruled there as king.²⁶³ None of these solutions proved entirely successful, though Ashur-nadin-shumi served six years—apparently without major disturbance—until an Assyrian expedition provoked the Elamites into breaking the peace. Time and again, through most of Sennacherib's reign, successful urban-tribal coalitions²⁶⁴ in Babylonia rallied against Assyria and won considerable support from neighboring powers, notably the Elamites but also occasionally the Arah's. In the case of Elam, the assistance was sometimes furnished after a substantial payment had been sent from the Babylonians to the Elamite ruler.²⁶⁵ Elam dispatched large numbers of troops and high-ranking military officers, who took command of allied forces in the major pitched battles. So long as Babylonia and Elam worked together, Assyria continued to have serious difficulties in the south.

As far as we know at present, Sennacherib's troubles in Babylonia began

provinces of the empire near where Sargon may have met his death. Cf. also n. 252 above.

One should note the reference to year 19 of Sargon (= 703 B.C.) in BM 17310 (cited in JCS 35 [1983] 13 Bn. 1); this might betoken unrest in Babylonia, as such posthumous datings often do.

261. There are very few letters known from Sennacherib's reign (Parpola, *ARINH*, p. 119 n. 1). The contrary opinion proposed by Dietrich in *WO* 4 (1967-68) 98-100, 192-206 should be examined more closely. See now also Brinkman, *RA* 77 (1983) 175-176.

262. Koldewey, *Das wieder erstehende Babylon*, 4th ed., pp. 52-53, 187; Unger, *Babylon*, p. 109. Published inscriptional evidence: Koldewey, *WVDOG* 2 10 and pl. 4 v (translated in Unger, *Babylon*, p. 279 no. 19).

263. JCS 25 (1973) 91-92, Ravn, *Studier Buhl*, pp. 217-230.

264. I.e., between the principal provincial powers of the older Babylonian population (centered in the cities) and the tribesmen (who were primarily town and village dwellers).

265. *JNES* 24 (1965) 161-166.

in 703.²⁶⁶ Early in that year, a provincial official from a prominent scribal family led a revolt and succeeded in making himself king as Marduk-zakir-shumi II.²⁶⁷ He was replaced after one month by the indefatigable Merodach-baladan, who in a nine-month reign assembled a powerful group of supporters: urban Babylonians, Chaldeans, Arameans, Elamites, and Arah's.²⁶⁸ Yati'e, queen of the Arah's, sent her brother Basqanu with an army. The Elamite king, Shutur-Nahhunte, after receiving a massive payment, sent eighty thousand bowmen and thirteen high-ranking commanders.²⁶⁹ Merodach-baladan split these forces into two groups, stationing them at Cutha and at his capital, Babylon; he himself remained in the capital.²⁷⁰

Sennacherib left the city of Assur in late 703.²⁷¹ He sent an advance party to Kish, just east of Babylon, while he concentrated his main forces against the allied army at Cutha. Merodach-baladan moved against the Assyrian contingent at Kish and forced them to send to Sennacherib for help;

266. Levine, *JCS* 34 (1982) 29-35, prefers the year 704 for the date of the Babylonian revolts and Sennacherib's initial military response; but this date can be defended only by neglecting or contravening chronological statements in Babylonian Kinglist A and the Babylonian Chronicle.

267. *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 24 and n. 137.

268. It may have been on this occasion that Merodach-baladan sent an embassy to Hezekiah of Judah, presumably to ensure solidarity and synchronization between the two rulers in their anti-Assyrian revolts (2 Kings 20:12-21; Isaiah 39:1-8; 2 Chronicles 32:31; Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, X.ii 2, cf. *Studies Oppenheim*, pp. 31-33). For the second reign of Merodach-baladan, see *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 26.

269. The number of Elamite archers listed in Sennacherib's inscription (*OIP* 249:9) may be an exaggeration calculated to enhance the magnitude of the Assyrian victory.

270. Levine, *JCS* 34 (1982) 36, states that the major anti-Assyrian force was positioned at Kish, but a careful reading of the text makes that unlikely. Sennacherib first sent his advance contingent to Kish (where Sargon had camped some years before); and, after its arrival, Merodach-baladan and his troops came out of Babylon's Zababa Gate (on the east side of the city, opening onto the road to Kish) and battled the Assyrian army near Kish (*OIP* 250:21). For the location of the Zababa Gate, see Unger, *Babylon*, pp. 74-75 and pl. 2.

271. The earliest account of Sennacherib's first campaign gives his departure date as XI-20. Levine (*JCS* 34 [1982] 29-35) points out some of the problems in interpreting this date in terms of the Babylonian calendar; but it is far from clear which calendar the Assyrian scribes were following in this text (see n. 258 above) or whether intercalations were made at the same time in Babylonia and Assyria (note the example of divergent intercalary months in the same year cited by Parpola, *LAS* 2 284 n. 524; cf. *ibid.*, p. 186 n. 323). These two factors could significantly distort correlation of Assyrian and Babylonian dates, and neither is taken into account by Levine.

Sennacherib stayed long enough to defeat the allies at Cutha and then descended to Kish. In advance of the Assyrian arrival, Merodach-baladan himself withdrew and took refuge in the marshes.²⁷² Sennacherib vanquished the allied forces remaining at Kish²⁷³ and then proceeded to Babylon, where he captured Merodach-baladan's wife and other female family members, the royal treasury, and many courtiers.²⁷⁴ Sennacherib attempted to set up a stable government in Babylon by installing as king a Babylonian commoner, Bel-ibni, whom Sennacherib's annals describe as a man "who had grown up in my palace like a young dog."²⁷⁵

Sennacherib moved against Merodach-baladan's supporters in tribal regions of Babylonia. The Assyrian army despoiled most major towns and many villages in the territory of four Chaldean tribes: Bit-Dakkuri, Bit-Sba'alli, Bit-Amukani, and Bit-Yakin. Urban rebels, both tribesmen and native Babylonians, were taken away as prisoners, as were many representatives of the principal Aramean tribes. Particular mention is made in Sennacherib's annals of Hararatu and Hirimmi, old border towns east of the Tigris:²⁷⁶ the former submitted voluntarily and was let off with

272. In the area of Guzumanni; Assyrian forces subsequently made an unsuccessful search for him there (OIP 2 51-52).

273. OIP 2 51. It may have been on or shortly after this occasion that Sennacherib deported people from Kish (reading uncertain: Assur Ostrakon, line 16, KAI no. 233 and Gibson, TSSI 2 20).

274. OIP 2 51-52.

275. OIP 2 54. Bel-ibni is described as a member of the Rab-bani family (DUMU LÜ.GAL.DÜ), one of the large kin groups later prominent in Babylonia. It is attested sporadically in the seventh century (e.g., at Uruk in 642 B.C. in YBC 3955:41 and at Dilbat in 629 B.C. in YBC 11388:33-34 = YBC 11400:34-35), but better known after the time of Nabopolassar (see Kömmel, *Familie, Beruf und Amt im spätbabylonischen Uruk*, pp. 95-97). Bel-ibni was also said in the Assyrian texts to be a native of Babylon (*pi-ri-ŠU AN NA KI*).

At what point in his campaign Sennacherib installed Bel-ibni as king is unclear. The earliest texts dated under Bel-ibni come from Dilbat in his accession year (703): XI-28 (unpublished, date according to Unger) and XII-7; documentation for these may be found in JCS 35 (1983) 14. Levine (JCS 34 [1982] 29-40) interprets the accounts of Sennacherib's earliest campaigns in a literal, chronological sense and places the installation of Bel-ibni after Sennacherib's campaign through Chaldea and after the Assyrian removal of dissident elements from Uruk, Nippur, Kish, and Hursagkalama; but it has yet to be established that events are related in chronological rather than topical order in the pertinent narratives (the latter style is obviously not foreign to Sennacherib's royal inscriptions).

276. Hararatu (Harutu) and Hirimmi were mentioned as border towns earlier in inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884) and Ashurnasirpal II (883-859). References in Parpola, AOAT 6 154 and 165; cf. PKB, pp. 391-393 and JCS 29 (1977) 60.

the payment of a heavy tribute; the latter had to be subdued by force and was required to make annual payments in cattle and produce to the Assyrian temples.²⁷⁷ This first campaign of Sennacherib stretched over into a second year (702) and was followed almost immediately by a short expedition into adjacent Iranian mountain regions occupied by Kassite and Yasubigalli tribes.²⁷⁸

When Sennacherib departed from southern Mesopotamia, he left Bel-ibni as monarch over the whole of Babylonia.²⁷⁹ Economic texts dated under the latter's reign show him recognized as ruler in the northern cities of Dilbat, Nippur, and Babylon;²⁸⁰ and a damaged tax-exemption document indicates that he was exercising authority in Chaldean territory at some point during these years.²⁸¹ But by early 700, his jurisdiction had been officially restricted to northern Babylonia; and Assyrian officials were said to be administering the south.²⁸² In fact, however, there is evidence that it was the Chaldeans—rather than the Assyrians—who were now in control of the south.²⁸³ In any case, in 700 Sennacherib regarded the situation in Babylonia as sufficiently out of hand that he mounted another

277. Is this Hirimmi identical with the Harimmi where a text (79-B-34) was dated under Sargon only four years earlier (JCS 35 [1983] 13 B.4)?

278. Sennacherib's second campaign was logically an extension of his first, but it is uncertain whether the army continued in the field without returning home to Assyria. Contrary to Levine's assertion in JCS 34 (1982) 37 that "no account of the first campaign ends with a statement that Sennacherib returned to Assyria," the principal Assyrian narrative dealing with just the first campaign says explicitly for Sennacherib after its main account *atūra ana qereb māt Aššur* "I returned to Assyria" (OIP 2 55:60; cf. Smith, *Senn.*, p. 44). The second campaign was discussed in detail by Levine, JNES 32 (1973) 312-317.

279. For letters that have sometimes been attributed to Bel-ibni, see RA 77 (1983) 175-176.

280. JCS 35 (1983) 14-15; VAT 15897 was excavated at Babylon, although the geographical name is lacking in the date formula.

281. According to the text published by Walker, *Iraq* 44 (1982) 70-75 no. 1, Bel-ibni—after the restoration of plundered divine statues to the Chaldean town (Sha)-usur-Adad—granted the town tax-exempt status. See also JCS 35 (1983) 15 En.1.

282. Bezold, KB 2 114-115, variant (as pointed out by Levine, *ARINH*, p. 63; contrast the interpretation by Liverani, *ARINH*, p. 256). Note also the discussion by Levine, JCS 34 (1982) 40.

283. Note that UET 4 206, a text from Ur, is dated under Merodach-baladan, apparently in the year 700 B.C. (see *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 16 for an interpretation of the date).

campaign against the region.²⁸⁴ He removed Bel-ihni and his officials to Assyria—whether for disloyalty or incompetence is not known—and installed as king in Babylon someone in whom he placed more confidence: his own eldest son, Ashur-nadin-shumi. The Assyrian forces campaigned briefly against the Chaldeans, defeating Mushezih-Marduk (“Shuzuhu the Chaldean”)²⁸⁵ in Bit-Dakkuri; but their most important achievement was driving Merodach-baladan, the thirty-year political veteran, out of Babylonia permanently. Merodach-baladan seems to have been caught by surprise; he fled across the ancient equivalent of the Hor al-Hammar to Nagitu, a settlement in the marshes on the Elamite side,²⁸⁶ where he died within the next few years.²⁸⁷ The Assyrians gradually reasserted their control over the south.²⁸⁸

With Merodach-baladan out of the way, Ashur-nadin-shumi’s stewardship in Babylonia (699-694) seems to have been the most peaceful and successful interval in Sennacherib’s early dealings with that country. Six years went by with no recorded revolts or disturbances. It is unfortunate that the reign is as yet so little documented,²⁸⁹ since it might have showed what this type of Assyrian administration could achieve under favorable conditions.²⁹⁰

284. The most detailed description of the campaign may be found in *OIP* 2 34-35 (with variants, including the versions published in *CT* 26 12-13 and *Sumer* 9 [1953] 140-144); for further sources, see Brinkman, *Studies Oppenheim*, pp. 26-27, and Grayson, *CAH* 3/2, 2nd ed., chapter 23, n. 14 (forthcoming; cited from ms.).

285. *OIP* 2 34, etc. Mushezih-Marduk was later to reign as king of Babylonia, 692-689; cf. nn. 295 and 301 below.

286. The exact location of Nagitu is unknown, but see the discussion in *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 27 and n. 152 and Levine, *JCS* 34 (1982) 41 (the “Persian Gulf” in both these treatments may prove to be a misnomer).

287. At least he is not mentioned again in Assyrian sources when military action was resumed in this area in 694.

288. Thus Ashur-nadin-shumi was recognized as king at Uruk already on VIII-5-700 B.C. (text in *Bagh. Mitt.* 5 [1970] 202-203 no. 3; for the date, see *Or* 41 [1972] 245).

289. Sources: *Or* 41 (1972) 245-248, supplemented by Parpola, *Iraq* 34 (1972) 21-34 and by *JCS* 35 (1983) 15-16; economic texts are attested from Uruk and Dilbat only. The kudurru Ashmolean 1933 1101 gives a stereotyped portrait of Ashur-nadin-shumi (RN: [AN SĀR]-‘SUM’-NA-MU); publications are listed in n. 195 above. The “remarkable Ashur-nadin-shumi tablet” (BM 77611+77612+) mentioned by Reade, *ARINH*, p. 162, dates in fact from the reign of Shamash-shum-ukin, but it mentions prebendary rights conferred by Ashur-nadin-shumi (AN.SĀR-SUM.NA-MU) when he was king of Babylon.

290. For a significantly different reconstruction of Babylonian history from 700 to 681, see Dietrich, *AOAT* 7 9-18 (with pertinent criticism in *Or* 46 [1977] 304-325).

In 694, Sennacherib decided to follow up on the successes of his campaign six years earlier and to attack the Yakinite exiles and the Elamites who had granted them refuge.²⁹¹ He sent a naval expedition across the marshes to the Elamite side, where it supposedly defeated both Elamites and Chaldeans and then took many of them as prisoners to Assyria.²⁹² The Elamites subsequently launched a counterattack against northern Babylonia,²⁹³ capturing Sippar and carrying off Ashur-nadin-shumi, who was betrayed by a group of Babylonians.²⁹⁴ The Elamite king, Hallushu-Inshushinak (699-693), then installed Nergal-ushezih, a member of the prominent Babylonian family of Gabal, on the throne in Babylon.²⁹⁵ An Assyrian army came against the Elamites and rebellious Babylonians, but suffered a reverse,²⁹⁶ and so the Elamites and Nergal-ushezih’s forces were left in control of northern Babylonia.

291. The fullest account of this campaign is in *OIP* 2 73-76.

292. *OIP* 2 87.

293. Olmstead (*AJS* 38 [1921-22] 80) and Levine (*JCS* 34 [1982] 43-48) prefer to disregard the passage cited in the preceding note (about the withdrawal of Sennacherib and his forces to Assyria, i.e., *ana māt Aššur ūrā*, before the Elamite counterattack) and contend instead that the Assyrian army was cut off by the Elamite move and trapped in southern Babylonia. Even prescinding from the textual evidence to the contrary, what likelihood is there that an Assyrian army was entrapped for “at least . . . nine months” without effective relief from Assyria, which was at this point the most powerful state in western Asia?

294. The betrayal of Ashur-nadin-shumi is mentioned in a letter published by Parpola, *Iraq* 34 (1972) 21-34.

295. Sennacherib’s Nebi Yunus inscription (*OIP* 2 87:28-29) and the Babylonian Chronicle ii 44-45 (*TCS* 5 78) credit the Elamite king with the installation of Nergal-ushezih; but some of Sennacherib’s other texts (e.g., *OIP* 2 38-39 iv 46-48 and 156:14-15) state that Nergal-ushezih “during (a period of) confusion in the land gave to himself (*ramanūš utirru*, subjunctive) the rule of Sumer and Akkad” and one text specifically calls him a “usurper,” *LUGAL.IM.GI* (text: Z1; *OIP* 2 156:14, as copied in 3 R 4 no. 4:47). Levine, who refers to a “popular uprising” at this time (*JCS* 34 [1982] 43), has been misled by Luckenbill’s old mistranslation of *ešītu*.

It should be noted that Sennacherib’s inscriptions refer to Nergal-ushezih as “Shuzubu the Babylonian” (as opposed to “Shuzubu the Chaldean,” an alternate name for Mushezih-Marduk, a member of the Bit-Dakkuri tribe, who was an object of Sennacherib’s campaign in 700 and served as king of Babylonia from 692 to 689). There is thus no third Shuzubu in the passages cited in *TCS* 5 232; the man involved is clearly Mushezih-Marduk (alias Shuzubu the Chaldean).

296. Thus according to the traditional restoration of a badly damaged passage in the Babylonian Chronicle ii 45 (*TCS* 5 78), though there is no mention of a previous battle (nor of an Assyrian advance). Sennacherib’s Nebi Yunus inscription (*OIP* 2 87) refers to an Assyrian army expedition sent against the king of Elam (in Babylonia), the routing of the Elamite army and the slaying/defeat of a son of the Elamite king, and then an Assyrian advance to Uruk (not

One wonders at this point which cities were supporting what cause, since subsequent military actions by each side seem to be taken against areas that would have been expected to be allied with them. The first events recorded by the Babylonian Chronicle for the next year (693) were Nergal-ushezih's capture and plundering of Nippur (dated IV-16).²⁹⁷ Then an Assyrian army pushed south, entered Uruk (VII-1),²⁹⁸ and took as spoil the statues of the principal gods of Uruk and Larsa.²⁹⁹ Finally the Assyrian army and that of Nergal-ushezih clashed on open ground in the province of Nippur (VII-7); Nergal-ushezih was taken prisoner and removed to Assyria. In the same month (VII-26) the Elamites deposed Hallushu-Inshushinak and replaced him with Kudur-Nahhunte. The Assyrians took advantage of the political vicissitudes in Elam and campaigned there until the onset of winter forced them to withdraw. At this time they managed to regain for Assyria territory that Sargon had lost almost three decades earlier.³⁰⁰ The Assyrians, however, did not attempt to regain control of northwestern urban Babylonia; and a Chaldean, Mushezih-Marduk of Bit-Dakkuri, succeeded Nergal-ushezih as king.³⁰¹

Eridu, as misread by Levine, *JCS* 34 [1982] 44). Note too the removal of the god AN.GAL from Der to Assyria on XI-1-694 (*TCS* 5 128 no. 15:1).

297. Babylonian Chronicle ii 46-47 (text in *TCS* 5 78).

298. Note that a text dated in the southern city of Targibatu on VI-19-693 implies that Nergal-ushezih had already lost power there (*UET* 4 204, with collations noted in *Or* 46 [1977] 317 no. 14). Levine's attributions of this text variously to VI-9 and IV-9 (*JCS* 34 [1982] 42 and 44) are simply misreadings.

299. Babylonian Chronicle ii 48-iii 3 (text in *TCS* 5 78-79; crucial to the interpretation of this passage are the translations and observations in Oppenheim, *ANET* p. 302 and Levine, *JCS* 34 [1982] 44-45 n. 52); *OIP* 2 87.

300. *OIP* 2 39; *AfO* 20 (1963) 90.

301. According to Assyrian sources (*OIP* 2 41-42), Mushezih-Marduk, otherwise known as Shuzubu the Chaldean, had previously been an official under the jurisdiction of the Assyrian governor of Lahiru; he had subsequently become an outlaw in the swamps of southern Babylonia. Sennacherib's fourth campaign (700 B.C.) had forced Mushezih-Marduk to withdraw to Elam, where he remained for several years. After his return, the Babylonians installed him as king.

Mushezih-Marduk is identified as a member of the Bit-Dakkuri tribe by the synchronistic kinglist A 117 iv 8 ("Mu-se-zib-Mar-duk DUMU "D[a-ku]-ri", personal collation [1971]; the latter part of the line has deteriorated over the years, but the excavation photo shows: "D[a-k]-u-ri").

Further sources on Mushezih-Marduk: (a) Kinglist A iv 18; (b) "Ptolemaic Canon"; (c) possibly the synchronistic kinglist KAV 9 iv 3' (see Grayson, *RLA* 6 122); (d) the Babylonian

In the following year, 692, another revolt in Elam removed Kudur-Nahhunte and brought his younger brother, Humhan-nimena (Menanu) to the throne.³⁰² Instability in throne tenure in both Elam and Babylonia had little immediate impact on the external politics of the two countries. Mushezih-Marduk, the new Chaldean king in Babylonia, had lived in Elam as an exile³⁰³ and so turned to Elam for military assistance. According to Assyrian accounts, the Babylonians under Mushezih-Marduk sent to the new Elamite ruler a substantial present of gold and silver taken from the treasury of the Marduk temple in Babylon.³⁰⁴ Together Babylonia and Elam assembled a wide array of troops, including Arameans, Chaldeans, and warriors from such diverse places in western Iran as Ellipi, Anshan (*Anzan*), and Fars (*Parsuaš*).³⁰⁵ Probably in 691,³⁰⁶ the allied forces marching north along the Tigris from Babylonia met the Assyrian army in a fiercely contested battle at the site of Halule.³⁰⁷ Assyrian sources claimed a victory of stunning proportions, but the Babylonian Chronicle stated that

Chronicle iii 12-24 (text in *TCS* 5 79-81), (e) *OIP* 2, *passim*, (f) economic texts from his reign. *JCS* 35 (1983) 17, (g) possible mention in a later letter: *ABL* 292 rev. 4-7 (cf. *JCS* 25 [1973] 92 n. 20 for interpretational difficulties).

Levine, *JCS* 34 (1982) 48, suggests that Sennacherib did not oppose Mushezih-Marduk's accession and that Mushezih-Marduk was loyal to the Assyrians until 691. This is possible according to a literal reading of a short passage in Sennacherib's annals (*OIP* 2 41 v 17-19), which claims that Mushezih-Marduk had revolted (*isēhū*, subjunctive) and the Babylonians had locked the gates of their city (*abullāt āli uddīlā*). How likely is it, after the troubles of the three preceding decades, that Sennacherib would have willingly acquiesced in the accession of yet another Chaldean to the Babylonian throne, much less this Chaldean who had previously revolted from Assyrian control?

302. Babylonian Chronicle iii 13-16 (text in *TCS* 5 80); cf. *OIP* 2 41 v 11-16.

303. *OIP* 2 42 v 26-28.

304. *OIP* 2 42 v 31-34.

305. *OIP* 2 43.

306. The date is recorded simply as "an unknown year" in the Babylonian Chronicle after the entry for 692 and before the entry for 689 (text in *TCS* 5 80); but the battle is recounted already in the Taylor Prism of Sennacherib, which is dated XII-20-eponymy of Bel-emuranni (691 B.C.).

307. Recent literature on Halule is cited in *JCS* 25 (1973) 93 n. 25. Although the exact location of the site is not known, it should perhaps be sought in the sparsely inhabited area south of Assur along the Tigris not too far from Samarra—a region vulnerable to Arab attack (note the men of Halule mentioned in *ABL* 262). Sennacherib's account implies that the Assyrian army was hindered because the Babylonian-Elamite coalition held the watering-places (*pān mašqīya šabtūma*, *OIP* 2 44 v 61), again an indication of desert or semi-desert terrain.

the allies forced the Assyrians to withdraw.³⁰⁸ The latter may be literally true, but the Babylonian-Elamite coalition probably achieved either a pyrrhic victory or one without significant lasting effects.³⁰⁹ By the next year, 690, the Assyrians were in a sufficiently strong position to erect a stele on the battle site³¹⁰ and to press forward a siege of Babylon itself. A legal text dated at Babylon on V-28-690 describes conditions in the city at that time:

In the reign of Mushezib-Marduk, king of Babylon, siege, famine, hunger, want, and hard times occurred in the land. Everything was changed and became as nothing. Two *qû* of barley (sold for) one shekel of silver. The city gates were locked, and no one could go out in any of the four directions. The corpses of men, with no one to bury them, filled the squares of Babylon.³¹¹

Despite its desperate state, Babylon held out for fifteen more months; but at the end of that time, Mushezib-Marduk could no longer count on the country's traditional sources of support from either east or west. The Assyrians had campaigned against and neutralized the Arabs at Adummatu in the western desert, probably in the year 690.³¹² In Nisan, the

308. *nabalkutu mât Aššur iltakan* (Babylonian Chronicle iii 18, text in TCS 5 80). Levine, JCS 34 (1982) 48-51, interprets this passage in a different light; he views the battle of Halule as temporarily stopping an Assyrian offensive. But he fails to ask a crucial question: where is Halule? Until we have a reasonable answer to that query, it is difficult to put the military events of the year 691 in perspective. The account of Sennacherib (e.g., OIP 2 43-44) describes the gathering of the allies and makes it sound as though they were the aggressors who seized Assyrian positions (note the pronominal suffix on *mašqīya*, OIP 2 44 v 61). Until better geographical evidence is available, the balance of the evidence seems to favor the allied armies as being on the offensive between Babylonia proper and Assyria proper and gaining a temporary advantage on the battlefield (note that the main versions of the annals stop their military narratives directly after the battle).

309. JCS 25 (1973) 93; cf. now JCS 34 (1982) 48-51.

310. AfO 20 (1963) 94:113-114.

311. Text: (1) *i-na BALA-e "Mu-še-zib-AMAR.UTU LUGAL DIN.TIR.KI* (2) *ú-su-ur-ti su-un-qu SU.KÛ-e hu-šab-hu* (3) *ú dan-na-at ina KUR iš-šá-kin-ma mim-mu* (4) *šu-uš-šú ba-šú-ú iš-ne-ma a-ki-i* (5) *šá la ba-še-e il-lik šá 1 GÍN KÛ BABBAR 2 SILA, ŠE BAR* (6) *KÁ.GAL.MEŠ in-ni-di-la-a-ma a-na er-bet-ti* (7) *šá-a-ri mu-ša-a la i-šá-a LÛ.ÜS.MEŠ UN.MEŠ* (8) *ina la LÛ qé-bi-ru mu-uš-ša-a re-ba-a-ti* (9) *ŠU.AN.NA.KI* (YBC 11377, being prepared for publication; previously translated in JCS 25 [1973] 93, cf. JNES 3 [1944] 43). For other texts from this reign, see JCS 35 (1983) 17.

312. Or it could be placed slightly earlier (in the latter part of 691) or later (in 689 before month IX). The date is discussed by Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, p. 118.

first month of 689, Humban-nimena, the Elamite king, suffered a stroke and lingered incapacitated for almost eleven months.³¹³ During this interval of dislocation in Elam, the city of Babylon fell to the Assyrians, just before the onset of winter (IX-I).³¹⁴

Thus ended the concerted Chaldean-led struggle for Babylonian independence. Three decades of revolts against Assyrian control had gradually united the tribal and non-tribal populations of Babylonia and schooled them in the value of outside alliances. Although the forces of Babylonia and its allies had eventually been subdued, their several successes in the face of Assyrian military superiority provided encouragement for future resistance movements. But in the meantime, with the collapse of Babylon in 689, Sennacherib was free to reap the fruits of victory.

313. Babylonian Chronicle iii 19-21 and 25 (text in TCS 5 80-81). Levine, JCS 34 (1982) 50, interprets part of the Bavian inscription (OIP 2 82-83:38-43) as a possible indication that the Assyrian army attacked Elam in the interval between the battle of Halule and the fall of Babylon. The passage, however, is difficult to interpret; and Levine, while criticizing the translation in CAD A/1 150 (*aggiš*, section b) and M/2 84 (*minde*, section e), offers no alternative translation to back up his historical inferences. This passage may deal with nothing more substantial than (alleged) fear in Elam of a potential Assyrian invasion (that never materialized); *tayartu*, one of the key words in the passage, may refer to the return of Elamites to their land, though the subject of the apparently plural *šakkanā* is unspecified.

314. Babylonian Chronicle iii 22 (text in TCS 5 80).

Babylon: Destruction and Rebirth,

689-669 B.C.³¹⁵

Sennacherib's treatment of Babylon in defeat was unexpectedly harsh. His forbearance had been taxed by several lengthy campaigns, by a protracted siege of the capital, and not least by the death in captivity of his eldest son, Ashur-nadin-sbumi. According to an official Assyrian account, the destruction of Babylon was brutal and systematic.³¹⁶ Assyrian soldiers put the defenders to death and left their corpses in the city's squares. They took away the defeated king, Mushezib-Marduk, and his family as prisoners to Assyria. Assyrian troops were allowed to loot the temples and other local property and to smash the statues of the city's gods.³¹⁷ They razed the city, including the residential quarters, the temples, the ziggurat, and the city walls, and dumped the debris into the Arahtu river.³¹⁸ They removed even the surface soil from the site, hauling it off to the Euphrates which carried it downstream to the Persian Gulf;³¹⁹ the Assyrians also put some of this soil on display in the *akitu* temple in Assur.³²⁰ To obliterate even the memory of the city, they dug canals to flood the ruins and turned the area into a swamp. The treatment of Babylon was exceptionally

315. This period has been dealt with in detail by G. Frame, *diss.*, chapter 4, sections 1-2. I am indebted to Dr. Frame for allowing me to draw on his account.

316. OIP 2 83-84; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 137-138.

317. Sennacherib also recovered and restored to Ekallate the statues of the gods Adad and Shala taken by the Babylonian king Marduk-nadin-ahhe (1099-1082 B.C.): OIP 2 83:48-50 (see PKB, pp. 124-126; cf. ABL 662 = LAS 1 no. 191 rev. 9^o).

318. In the texts of Sennacherib, the Arahtu seems to be the principal watercourse flowing through Babylon; and it joins the Euphrates only considerably downstream from the city. Shortly thereafter, in the texts of Esarhaddon, the Arahtu and Euphrates are both said to pass through Babylon (Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 14 and 19 Episodes 7 and 18). The problems are discussed briefly in *Power and Propaganda*, pp. 240-241 n. 8.

319. According to a claim of Sennacherib (OIP 2 137), it was eventually visible as far away as the island of Dilmun, modern Bahrain.

320. OIP 2 138.

ruthless and vindictive, well beyond the retribution usually exacted of a rebel city and far in excess of the punishment expected for a venerable religious center, no matter what its offenses.³²¹

Sennacherib's graphic account of the city's destruction has yet to be substantiated from independent sources. Lengthy excavations at Babylon by the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft at the beginning of this century found various destruction levels, but none clearly assignable to the time of Sennacherib.³²² The Babylonian Chronicle records the capture of the city in 689, but says nothing about subsequent plundering or destruction. Later texts of Esarhaddon describe in detail how the city was destroyed and turned into a swamp, how the gods deserted it, and how its population went into slavery in foreign lands;³²³ but these say nothing about the date of the destruction or Assyrian involvement and identify the destructive agency as a flood caused by the wrath of Marduk.³²⁴ In general, Babylonian writers seem to have avoided the topic except to record that the Marduk cult was interrupted for two decades.³²⁵ Later Assyrian scribes, when they mentioned the affair at all, tastefully omitted reference to participation on the part of their countrymen.³²⁶

321. The avowed ferocity of the treatment may reflect the personal character of Sennacherib's anger against the betrayers of his eldest son.

322. There is, however, evidence in the Merkes quarter of Babylon that has been interpreted as showing an abandonment of that area, a tentative and sparse rebuilding, and then a restoration of the quarter. Although there is no evidence for destruction by flood or significant water damage, Reuther interpreted these successive levels as abandonment at the time of Sennacherib's devastation, partial and comparatively poor rebuilding (scattered houses with thin walls [perhaps under Esarhaddon?]), then full-scale revival and repopulation in the days of the Nebuchadnezzar dynasty (*WVDOG* 47 21-25, 60-64). Sennacherib's activities in Babylon may of course have been obscured by the extensive Neo-Babylonian renewal of the city.

323. Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 14-15, with variants as outlined in *JAOS* 103 (1983) 39.

324. According to the Assyrians, Marduk had been angered by the misconduct of the Babylonians and especially by their use of temple property to pay for Elamite military assistance. Esarhaddon's selective historical treatment of Babylon's destruction is discussed in *JAOS* 103 (1983) 35-42.

325. This theme was treated more frankly by the time of Nabonidus (555-539 B.C.), who openly described the destruction of Babylon's shrines and the deportation of Marduk to Assyria (*VAB* 4 270-272 no. 8 col. i).

326. See J. J. M. Roberts, "Myth versus History," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 1-13. Note also the Marduk ordeal text, an Assyrian cultic commentary which describes a trial of Marduk by the gods in connection with rebellion and plundering (of Babylon?); von Soden, *ZA* 51 (1955) 130-166,

Sennacherib's brutal actions against the old capital and the enforced suspension of the land's primary religious cult³²⁷ would have profoundly shocked the urban Babylonians. This is reflected in later traditions, including the Babylonian Chronicle and the "Ptolemaic Canon," which did not recognize Sennacherib's second reign over the land (688-681) and officially referred to the period as "kingless."³²⁸ It is possible that Sennacherib about this time took action against other parts of Babylonia, such as Der,³²⁹ Sippar-Annunitu,³³⁰ and Bit-Amukani.³³¹ After the destruction of Babylon, Sennacherib himself does not seem to have been overly concerned with the governance of the country. In northwest Babylonia, Chaldeans were permitted to take over agricultural land which had belonged to citizens of Babylon and Borsippa.³³² During these eight years, economic activity in Babylonia sank to the lowest level in six

has suggested the primary composition of this piece took place in the time of Sennacherib and a possible later redaction in the time of Esarhaddon (see now also Frymer-Kensky, *JAOS* 103 [1983] 131-141).

327. Because of the absence or destruction of the statue of Marduk, the tutelary deity.

328. Note too the curious posthumous dating by the twelfth year of Ashur-nadin-shumi used at Borsippa in 688 (*JCS* 35 [1983] 16 Fn.5).

329. Der had been incorporated into Assyria by the late eighth century (*VAS* 170, etc.), and its god AN CAL had been removed to Assyria in 694 at the time of the Nergal-ushezib revolt (Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle, line 1; text in *TCS* 5 128). We have no explicit information about its fate in 689, but in 680 its gods were returned (Babylonian Chronicle ii 44-45; Esarhaddon Chronicle, line 3; texts in *TCS* 5 82 and 125; cf. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 84). The major temple of Der (Edingalkalama) was rebuilt in the time of Esarhaddon (Parpola, *LAS* 2 188).

330. Where the city and the temple Eulmash were destroyed. An inscription of Nabonidus (*CT* 34 34 iii 28-29) describes the destruction with the words *ušālik karmūtu* ("he turned [them] into a ruin"). The text gives no indication whether the damage to the city and temple were inflicted now (689 or later) or in fighting earlier in Sennacherib's reign. Cf. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 84 (mentioning Sippar-Aruru).

331. Note the rich booty from Bit-Amukani presented by Sennacherib to Esarhaddon, after the latter had been designated crown prince and renamed Ashur-etel(li)-(ilani)-mukin-apli: *ADD* 620 = *ABL* 1452 = *ARU* 13 = *ARAB* 2 §613; see the collations by Postgate, *NARCD*, p. 123. The despoiling of Bit-Amukani which resulted in the taking of this booty is presumably to be distinguished from the Assyrian campaign in the same area in 703-702, but *ADD* 620 has no date to help us determine when the Assyrian action took place.

332. Cf. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 52 Episode 12 (time unspecified).

decades: there are only three known economic texts from this time, two of them dated at Nippur and one at Hursagkalama (the twin city of Kish).³³³ Southern Babylonia may have fared better than the north during this interval. Toward the very end of Sennacherib's reign, in 681, the gods of Uruk, stolen twelve years earlier, were restored to their city.³³⁴ Also in the south, it seems likely that provincial governors who were subsequently prominent, Nabu-zer-kitti-lisur of the Sealand and Ningal-iddin of Ur, were appointed in the second half of Sennacherib's reign;³³⁵ but, as with so many other subjects pertaining to this time, adequate attestation is lacking. There is very little documentation in either Assyria or Babylonia to cover these years.³³⁶

The assassination of Sennacherib and the accession of Esarhaddon in late 681 marked a turning point in Babylonian history.³³⁷ Whereas the preceding decades had been characterized by repeated Assyrian invasions and by the instability of the Babylonian crown (ten changes of monarch in twenty-nine years),³³⁸ Esarhaddon's reign stabilized throne tenure and brought enlightened policies of rule. He restored the Babylonian capital as both a political and commercial center and took an interest in the reallocation of agricultural resources.³³⁹ This new stability and concern fostered a gradually increasing material prosperity and initiated a major

333. Babylonian economic texts dated under Sennacherib from the years 688-681 are listed in *JCS* 35 (1983) 14. According to a later report, Sennacherib also granted the people of Nippur the right to take water from the Banitu canal (*ABL* 327), though the exercise of the right was blocked by a local leader.

334. Babylonian Chronicle iii 29 (return of statues); cf. *ibid.*, iii 2-3 (theft). Contrary to the edition in *TCS* 5 79 and 81, the text does not support the contention that the statues were removed to Elam (cf. n. 299 above). Note also Sennacherib's gift of Puqudu tribesmen as *širkātu* to the goddesses Ishtar and Nanaya at Uruk (*BIN* 2 132:3-4, RN to be read "30-SES.<<PAB>>.ME-SU; cf. *ibid.*, line 14).

335. These were both involved in hostilities in the very first year of Esarhaddon, 680 (Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 46-47 Episode 4; cf. Babylonian Chronicle iii 39-40, text in *TCS* 5 82).

336. Other than Assyrian legal and administrative documents.

337. For details about the murder of Sennacherib and the accession of Esarhaddon, see Parpola in B. Alster, ed., *Death in Mesopotamia*, pp. 171-182; for the dates see Brinkman, *JAOS* 103 (1983) 35 n. 1. See also n. 346 below.

338. Including the violent deaths of the last two monarchs who had ruled simultaneously over Assyria and Babylonia (Sargon in 705 and Sennacherib in 681).

339. Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 25-26 Episode 37 Fassung a; *ibid.*, p. 52 Episode 12. Cf. *ABL* 327.

cycle of sustained economic growth that was to last, with only one minor recession, for the next fifty years.³⁴⁰ Although it is difficult to articulate chronologically many of the events of Esarhaddon's reign (his royal inscriptions generally eschew the numbered campaigns of his immediate predecessors), major trends may be discerned; and these mark a sharp reversal of previously prevailing policies. In general, to judge from the official stance conveyed in his royal inscriptions,³⁴¹ Esarhaddon fostered a policy of peaceful relations with both Babylonia and its immediate neighbors, Elam and the Arab tribes. His non-confrontational politics bore fruit in that Babylonia as a whole never united against Esarhaddon's rule, and local disturbances did not attract widespread support from either inside or outside the country.³⁴²

It is difficult to determine forces and motives behind the Assyrian change of direction. The time-honored explanation of a pro-Babylonian party in Assyria may have merit, but is in need of detailed critical reexamination.³⁴³ One should not underestimate the impact of Sennacherib's violent death on the impressionable and valetudinarian Esarhaddon, who seems in any case to have been excessively preoccupied with manifestations of divine will.³⁴⁴ Nor should one neglect social and economic factors which may have been conducive to change. But, however great our ignorance of the underlying causes, it is plain that Esarhaddon in effect abandoned Sennacherib's harsh anti-Babylonian stance and returned to the more conciliatory attitude of his grandfather.³⁴⁵

340. At which point it was absorbed in the rising fortunes of the Neo-Babylonian empire under Nabopolassar. For Babylonian economic texts from Esarhaddon's reign, see *JCS* 35 (1983) 17-20.

341. Landsberger, *Bischof*, p. 16, suggests that Esarhaddon's Babylonian policy was purely cosmetic. Cf. *ABL* 340 (= *LAS* 1 no. 276).

342. For a substantially different picture of this time, see Dietrich, *AOAT* 7 19-68 (with the reservations noted in *Or* 46 [1977] 304-325). Parpola, *LAS* 2, attempts to date on astronomical or astrological grounds many of the communications in the Nineveh archives and offers a plethora of suggestions pertinent to Babylonian history, especially for the years 674-665.

343. Nor is there any reliable evidence that either Esarhaddon's mother (Zakutu/Naqī'a) or his principal wife (Ešarra-hamat) was Babylonian or from Babylonia; see *JAOS* 103 (1983) 36 n. 5. There is also no merit to H. Lewy's hypothesis that Zakutu was regent in Babylonia from 683 to 670 (*JNES* 11 [1952] 272-277).

344. E.g., *JAOS* 103 (1983) 37. How much this may have been conditioned by Esarhaddon's physical state (discussed in detail by Parpola, *LAS* 2 229-236) deserves further investigation.

345. Cf. *JAOS* 103 (1983) 36 n. 5.

Esarhaddon, however, was unable to proceed with his program directly after his accession. With the assassination of Sennacherib and the ensuing civil disturbances in Assyria,³⁴⁶ the uncertainties in the royal succession there were perceived in Babylonia as signs of political weakness and grasped by some as an opportunity for revolt.³⁴⁷ Inchoate rebels looked for support to Elam, the erstwhile backer of Babylonia. A Babylonian conspirator wrote to the Elamite king (Humban-haltash II), pointed out Assyria's vulnerability in the wake of Sennacherib's death, and sent generous gifts to enlist Elamite support.³⁴⁸ The governor of the Sealand, Nabu-zer-kitti-lishir³⁴⁹ of the Yakin tribe, took more direct action. He moved his men into siege positions around Ur, the only major city in southeastern Babylonia not under direct Yakinite control. After Esarhaddon had gained the upper band in the delicate political situation in Assyria, he dispatched troops south to relieve Ur. Anticipating their arrival, Nabu-zer-kitti-lishir withdrew to the supposed safety of Elam, where he was put to death. His brother, Na'id-Marduk, who had accompanied him, realized that the old Elamite-Yakin alliance was not to be revived and fled to Nineveh to submit to Esarhaddon. The Assyrian king installed Na'id-Marduk as governor of the Sealand in his brother's stead and imposed a heavy annual tribute on the province. Thus Esarhaddon, with the cooperation of Elam, was able both to preserve the anti-Yakinite enclave at Ur and to gain an acceptable Chaldean governor to preside over the strategic Sealand territories.³⁵⁰

346. The revolt in Assyria lasted for about six weeks after Sennacherib's death according to the Babylonian Chronicle iii 36-37 (text in TCS 5 81). Larsen, *RA* 68 (1974) 22, has plausibly suggested that political disturbances in Assyria may have started much earlier in the year 681. See also the description by Tadmor and Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, pp. 38-41.

347. But note that a legal text was dated in Babylonia under Esarhaddon already in his accession year (Owen and Watanabe, *Or. Ant.* 22 [1983] 37-48; the long comment on the significance of *rēš šarrūti* *ibid.*, pp. 37-38 n. 3 fails to differentiate Babylonian from Assyrian usage). Another legal text, IM 65069 (W. 20032.1), once attributed to the accession year of Esarhaddon (*UVB* 18 41; *Bagh. Mitt.* 5 [1970] 202-203 no. 3), is actually from the accession year of Ashur-nadin-shumi (*Or* 41 [1972] 245).

348. Weidner, *AfO* 17 (1954-56) 5-9.

349. Son of the former ruler Merodach-baladan II.

350. Babylonian Chronicle iii 39-42 (text in TCS 5 82). Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 46-48 Episode 4. Note also the comments of Tadmor and Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, pp. 46-47.

Having circumvented these early troubles, Esarhaddon proceeded to implement his policy of reinstating Babylon as political and commercial capital of southern Mesopotamia.³⁵¹ His description of the restoration is worth summarizing, since it gives a detailed statement of what Esarhaddon intended to accomplish for Babylon as well as an Assyrian "theological" interpretation of Babylon's misfortunes and their redress.³⁵² In Esarhaddon's Babylon inscriptions, attention is focused on the divine framework within which the destruction and resurrection of Babylon occurred: portentous omens, the iniquitous conduct of the Babylonians (including misappropriation of temple funds), the destruction of the city by a severe flood,³⁵³ Marduk's decision to shorten the years of desolation (from 70 to 11),³⁵⁴ auspicious omens, and restoration. The Assyrians assembled a large group of skilled workmen drawn—according to various versions—from all of Babylonia, from Assyria, and/or from conquered lands;³⁵⁵ and Esarhaddon claimed to have taken part in the work personally.³⁵⁶ Babylonian workers prepared the site, clearing reeds and trees and restoring the Euphrates to its old bed.³⁵⁷ Craftsmen supervised

351. Esarhaddon may have begun the restoration of Babylon quite early in his reign, though the exact date is uncertain. The dated versions of Esarhaddon's inscriptions which relate these events in detail (Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 10-29, with supplements) come from his *šanat rēš šarrūti*, which may be associated in Assyria with the year 680 or shortly thereafter (cf. Landsberger, *Bischof*, pp. 18-19; Borger, *BiOr* 29 [1972] 34-35; note the reservations of Cogan in Tadmor and Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, pp. 85-87). This phrase does not mean "accession year" in the Babylonian sense (i.e., 681) since Esarhaddon did not ascend the throne until the twelfth month of that year and one of his inscriptions is dated in the second month of the *šanat rēš šarrūti* (Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 29 Version C). The Assyrian *rēš šarrūti* is often used in a generic sense, "at/towards the beginning (i.e., early years) of my reign."

352. For the general literary background of the Babylon texts, see Landsberger, *Bischof*, *passim*; Brinkman, *JAOS* 103 (1983) 35-42; Cogan in Tadmor and Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, pp. 76-85 (especially for Version E).

353. The role of the Assyrian military is conspicuously absent from the narrative.

354. This numerical shift is accomplished in Mesopotamian cuneiform script simply by reversing the sequence of the two wedges involved. For the Akkadian terminology, see Shaffer, *RA* 75 (1981) 188 no. 6.

355. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 20 Episode 19; see now the comments of Cogan in Tadmor and Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, pp. 80-81.

356. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 20 Episode 21.

357. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 19 Episode 18. Note, however, that the wandering river was described elsewhere as the Arahtu (*ibid.*, p. 14 Episode 7a).

massive construction works in the city, including the rebuilding of Esagila (the Marduk temple), Etemenanki (the ziggurat), and the inner and outer city walls.³⁵⁸ Statues of gods and goddesses that had been taken as spoil were returned from Assyria and from Elam.³⁵⁹ Enslaved or impoverished exiles were brought back to the city and provided with clothing, housing, orchards, and even canals (presumably for irrigation of crops).³⁶⁰ The citizens' old privileges, including tax exemptions, were reinstated.³⁶¹ Babylon was restored as the mercantile hub of the region, with routes opened up in all directions and commercial relations reestablished.³⁶² These were Esarhaddon's avowed intentions for Babylonia, according to his inscriptions.³⁶³ Details can be added from other sources: agricultural lands around Babylon and Borsippa were taken from Chaldean encroachers and restored to their rightful owners; a new governor of Babylon was appointed to supervise the resettlement of the city; and the local assembly of citizens was again convened to hear law cases.³⁶⁴

358. Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 24-25 Episodes 33-35.

359. This does not include the images of the principal deities of Babylon, i.e., Marduk and his wife Zarpanitu. Although Esarhaddon later intended to restore these statues and even recorded that he had done so (Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 88-89; cf. *ibid.*, p. 7 Ass. C iii), his attempt was aborted; see the discussion by Parpola, *LAS* 2 32-35. For the reading Zarpanitu, see Goetze, *JCS* 17 (1963) 84-85, and Parpola, *LAS* 2 107.

Parpola, *LAS* 2 188, suggests that a substitute statue of Marduk was used at Babylon in the time of Esarhaddon.

360. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 25 Episode 37 Fassung a, lines 12-33.

361. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 25 Episode 37 Fassung a, lines 33-38; cf. *ibid.*, lines 14-17 and p. 26 Fassung b, lines 34-35.

362. Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 25-26 Episode 37 Fassung a, lines 38-42.

363. The various versions of Esarhaddon's Babylon texts are edited in Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 10-30. Supplementary material: Borger, *Afo* 18 (1957-58) 113-116; Borger, *Afo* 19 (1959-60) 148; Borger, *BiOr* 21 (1964) 143-148; Borger, *HKL* 2 18; Millard, *Afo* 24 (1973) 117-119 and pls. 13-14; Nougayrol, *Afo* 18 (1957-58) 314-318 and pls. 21-22; Pinches, *CT* 443-9; Pinches, *CT* 51 78. Updated textual apparatus for Episodes 2-9 (Bab. A-"H"): Brinkman, *JAOS* 103 (1983) 38.

Note that one of Esarhaddon's accounts of the rebuilding of Babylon is on BM 91027 (60-12-1,1) [= Borger, *Asarh.*, Bab. D], a basalt stele with elaborate symbols (= *ANEP* no. 88; see Luckenbill's ingenious explanations in *AJSL* 41 [1924-25] 169-172), some of which seem to be religious in character. This BM number should be added to the textual apparatus chart in *JAOS* 103 (1983) 38, version D.

364. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 52 Episode 12; *ABL* 418; Strassmaier, *Huitième Congrès*, no. 4.

Esarhaddon's statement was programmatic; not all the work he describes was done at once, and some of it may not have been done at all. The material remains at Babylon have not permitted detailed verification of his claims. Though there are bricks bearing his inscriptions, none of these has been recovered in unmistakably contemporary context; they were either found loose in rubble or reused in later construction.³⁶⁵ Correspondence preserved in the Nineveh archives includes a letter from Ubaru, Esarhaddon's new governor at Babylon,³⁶⁶ reporting to the king on his arrival in the city. Although we must allow for a generous dose of courtly obsequiousness, Ubaru states that he had been welcomed by the men of Babylon and that the king had been praised for restoring stolen property to the city; even the Chaldean leaders are said to have blessed the king for resettling the capital.³⁶⁷ To round out the rosy picture, one should note that Esarhaddon used the spoils of his Egyptian campaigns to sponsor temple reconstruction (also at Borsippa, Nippur, and Uruk)³⁶⁸ and

365. See the pertinent sections of Koldewey, *WVDOG* 15; Reuther, *WVDOG* 47; Koldewey, *Das wieder erstehende Babylon*, 4th ed.

366. Ubaru may have replaced the oppressive officials appointed by Sennacherib, if Parpola's interpretation and dating of *RMA* 272 rev. 13-19 are correct (*LAS* 2 37, 296).

367. *ABL* 418, written shortly after the arrival of Ubaru, the new *šakin fēmt*, in the city. A contemporary legal document dated at Babylon in the non-canonical eponymy of Ubaru was witnessed by several prominent Babylonian religious leaders and by an Assyrian army commander (the tablet, formerly Amherst 224 and published by Pinches and Weidner, *Afo* 13 [1939-41] 51-55 and pls. 3-4, was recently rediscovered and sold at Sotheby's on July 11, 1983; see *JCS* 35 [1983] 62 under S.7). Ubaru, also mentioned in *ABL* 327 rev. 11 and *ABL* 702:5, is presumably the hapless governor of Babylon whose tribulations are described in *ABL* 340 (= *LAS* 1 no. 276). Parpola in *LAS* 2 303 suggests dates for some of these letters.

368. Borsippa: Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 32 (heavily restored); note the recopying in the time of Esarhaddon of an old inscription of Adad-apla-iddina (1068-1047 B.C.) on the belt of Nabu at Borsippa (Cadd, *Studia Orientalia* 1 [1925] 29-33; cf. Hunger, *Kolophon*, no. 498 and Parpola, *LAS* 2 452-453 no. 14). Nippur (restoration of the Ekur, the É-bára-dúr-gar-ra of Inanna, and a temple well): Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 70-71; Goetze, *JCS* 17 (1963) 119-131; Biggs, *AS* 17 no. 30; Civil, *RA* 68 (1974) 94 no. 8, for the archeology of the contemporary Inanna temple, see the general remarks by Crawford, *Archaeology* 12 (1959) 79 and 82 (temple of level III), and by Hansen and Dales, *Archaeology* 15 (1962) 75-84 (level renumbered as 1). Uruk (rebuilding in the Eanna complex): Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 73-78, cf. *UVB* 854-55 and *UVB* 26-27 13, note also Esarhaddon's prayer from Uruk mentioning his grandfather Sargon (*LKU* 46; see Borger, *Afo* 18 [1957-58] 116-117) and his confirmation of Sargon's and Sennacherib's gifts of members of the Puqudu tribe to temples in Uruk (*BIN* 2 132:5-7; contra *HKL* 1 216, the text was clearly written after the time of Esarhaddon, since Kudurru, the governor of Uruk mentioned in lines 8 and 12 [collated], took office only in 649 or later [*Or* 46 (1977) 311]).

Assyrian court correspondence also sheds light on temple construction and refurbishing of

returned divine statues to Der, Uruk, Larsa, and Sippar-Aruru.³⁶⁹ Booty from an Assyrian campaign in Shubria near Lake Van was sent as a gift to Uruk.³⁷⁰ The Assyrians under Esarhaddon actively sought reconciliation with Babylonia.³⁷¹

Assyrian policies, however enlightened, did not elicit unanimous support from Babylonian officialdom or from local populations. In the central and northern alluvium, Nippur and Bit-Dakkuri did not welcome the resurgence of Babylon, a regional rival; and there were severe disturbances in these areas, particularly in the first half of the reign when the resettlement of Babylon was still under way.³⁷² The chief bone of contention may have been access to primary agricultural resources, namely land and water.³⁷³ In addition, increased supervision by the central government may not have appealed to local officials who had fattened their purses in the looser conditions prevalent under Sennacherih; officials

cult statues in Babylonia (including Babylon) in the time of Esarhaddon: for example, see ABL 257, 404, 1202, 1214; CT 53 34, 75, 106; LAS 1 nos. 58, 281-284, 291 (= editions of ABL and CT texts cited above); Landsberger, *Bischof*; LAS 2 xvi, 62-64, 273-284, 291-296, 428-429, 465 no. 65. The connection of this construction with booty from the campaigning in Egypt (Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 94:28-29) would imply that most of the reconstruction in Babylonia was accomplished late in Esarhaddon's reign (LAS 2 263 and *passim*; note also the texts treated by Lambert in *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 [1982] 61-70). The date of the restoration of Babylon requires further study (note also the comments by Cogan in Tadmor and Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, pp. 85-87).

369. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 84; cf. Goetze, *JCS* 17 (1963) 129-130, and the damaged chronicle passages in TCS 5 82:44-46, 125:3-4. The date of the return of the statues is discussed by Parpola, LAS 2 184 and 300. Ishtar and other gods of the city returned to Agade from Elam in 674 (Babylonian Chronicle iv 17-18 in TCS 5 84 and Esarhaddon Chronicle, lines 21-22 in TCS 5 126 [see also n. 383 below]); for the historical context and another possibly pertinent text, see the suggestions by McEwan, *AfO Beiheft* 19, pp. 8-9 and n. 12. Landsberger's proposal (*Bischof*, pp. 38-39) that "Akkad" was simply a code name for Babylon now seems unlikely for both the Middle Babylonian and Neo-Babylonian periods; see now also Parpola, LAS 2 263-264 and 515-516, and McEwan, *AfO Beiheft* 19, p. 12.

370. Babylonian Chronicle iv 19-21 (text in TCS 5 84-85). The chronicle statement as it stands seems to be inconsistent (the booty supposedly arrives in Uruk one month before the capture of the looted city).

371. Note too that the eponyms for the years 673 and 670 were the governors of Lahiru and Der, Babylonian cities that had previously been annexed to Assyria.

372. See the chronicle entries concerning Bit-Dakkuri and Nippur for the years 678 and 675, and compare the entry for 680 (texts in TCS 5 82-84, 126).

373. The manipulation of water rights as a political tool may be seen in ABL 327 (= Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia*, no. 121) and CT 53 75 (= LAS 1 no. 284).

at Borsippa, Cutha, and Dur-Sharrukin were accused of collusion with local financial interests and of blatant speculation with temple revenues.³⁷⁴ Even at Babylon, matters were not as straightforward as official texts would have us believe. A heavy tax was levied on the impoverished—and supposedly tax-exempt—citizens, and stories circulated of a protest in which the governor's messengers were pelted with clods.³⁷⁵

Esarhaddon dealt benevolently with Babylonia's erstwhile allies, the Arabs and the Elamites, with mutually favorable results. For the Arabs, Esarhaddon was in part reversing the harshness of Sennacherih; he returned stolen statues of deities to the ruler Hazael and only modestly increased his tribute. He appointed Tahua, a young Arab woman raised at Sennacherih's court, as queen of the Arabs and restored missing divine statues to her people. Later he confirmed Yauta', son of Hazael, as king after his father's death. Although the Arab west was not totally quiet during Esarhaddon's reign, it was often occupied with internal squabbles; only a few sections of it were visited by Assyrian campaigns in the time of Esarhaddon.³⁷⁶

374. ABL 339 and 1202 (= LAS 1 nos. 293 and 281); CT 53 75 (= LAS 1 no. 284). For ABL 1202, note Parpola's comments in LAS 2 273-275 and 510. Cf. also n. 366 above.

375. ABL 340 (= LAS 1 no. 276). In this connection, inferences concerning Assyrian conscription of troops in Babylonia in the years 679, 677, and 652 seem premature and based on insufficient evidence. These conclusions have been drawn from chronicle entries which use a stereotyped phrase *rab bitī ina māt Akkadi bihirtu* (var. *biḫirti*) *ibteḫir* "the steward made/did *bihirtu* in Akkad" (texts in TCS 5 82-83, 125-126, 131). The meanings of the verb *beḫēru*, of its cognate noun *bihirtu*, and of the corresponding family name *Bēḫiru* in Akkadian are far from clear. The CAD and AHw, both following a suggestion by Landsberger in ZA 37 (1927) 74, consider *beḫēru* as a Neo-Babylonian loanword from Aramaic בחר and translate *bihirtu beḫēru* as "to levy (troops)." (Similarly also Tadmor in Nissen and Renger, eds., *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn*, p. 454.) But בחר in Aramaic and Hebrew does not seem to have this technical meaning; it means principally "to choose" or "to examine" (which is clearly also the sense of the only known Babylonian passage in which *beḫēru* occurs outside the conventional chronicle phrase: BIN 1 68:24). In Hebrew there is a secondary usage of the passive participle בחר to refer to "select" (warriors), i.e., those chosen, without connotation of the way in which they were selected, but there is no evidence that this derived meaning was found also in Babylonian. The question needs more systematic investigation, especially into the functions of the *rab bitī* (a generic word for "steward," ranging from steward of a relatively small household to steward as a high government official); it may not be purely coincidental that each recorded instance of the steward's *bihirtu* was followed within two years or less by political disturbances in Babylonia.

376. Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, pp. 125-142; cf. Parpola, LAS 2 514 (comment on LAS 1 no. 15).

Esarhaddon's relations with Elam were surprisingly peaceful and on occasion even cordial. After decades of active Elamite-Assyrian hostility (720-691), there followed a significant quiet interval (690-665) which Esarhaddon undoubtedly fostered. As noted above (p. 72), the Elamite king Humban-haltash II resisted Babylonian attempts to involve him in anti-Assyrian resistance in Esarhaddon's early years. The Assyrians, however, did not place unquestioning trust in the peaceful intentions of the Elamites; Esarhaddon reached an understanding with the paramount Aramean tribe on Babylon's eastern frontier, the Gambulu (under their sheikh Bel-iqisha), so that their chief city Sba-pi-Bel could monitor Elamite movements across the frontier.³⁷⁷ The only obvious Elamite act of hostility that can be unambiguously assigned to Esarhaddon's reign is their raid on Sippar in the year 675.³⁷⁸ This stands out as an isolated event, the only apparent disruption in a quarter century of otherwise good relations between Assyria and Elam. There are at least two divergent ways of explaining it: either (a) as Elamite conjuncture with contemporaneous disturbances in Bit-Dakkuri and Nippur,³⁷⁹ or (h) as a lapse of the chronicler, who inserted for the sixth year of Esarhaddon an entry originally composed for the sixth year of his similarly named brother who reigned two decades earlier.³⁸⁰

377. The lengthiest account of relations with Bel-iqisha at this time is in Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 52-53 Episode 13. Cf. ABL 541 and 336 (in the latter Bel-iqisha is said to have visited western Babylonia and to have married some of his daughters to urbanites there).

378. Babylonian Chronicle iv 9-10 (text in TCS 5 83).

379. All taking place in 675, according to the chronicles. The raid on Sippar could have removed cult statues from the city of Akkad, since these were returned from Elam in the following year (Babylonian Chronicle iv 17-18; text in TCS 5 84).

380. This alternative must be regarded as considerably less likely. Emendation of a text should be a last resort, but there are grounds for subjecting the pertinent chronicle passage (Babylonian Chronicle iv 9-10; text in TCS 5 83) to closer scrutiny. This chronicle's two entries relating to Elamite assaults on Sippar in 694 (the sixth year of Ashur-nadin-shumi) and in 675 (the sixth year of Esarhaddon) have similar phraseology to describe the Elamite king's entry into Sippar, the slaughter/defeat (GAZ) of the inhabitants, and the restriction of Shamash to the Ebabbar temple (ii 40-41 vs. iv 9-10). The two kings ruling in Babylonia in 694 and 675 have names that are often written in practically the same way, that is with the difference of one easily confused sign (AN.ŠAR-MU-MU versus AN.ŠAR-ŠEŠ-MU); and the ŠEŠ/MU similarity has led to misreadings by cuneiformists (*Or* 41 [1972] 245). For the year 675, the Babylonian Chronicle and the often parallel Esarhaddon Chronicle have three out of four events in common; but the Esarhaddon Chronicle omits the Elamite raid. Furthermore the portion of the Babylonian Chronicle that deals with the reign of Esarhaddon has obvious dating discrepancies (in connection with the Shubria incident, the first Egyptian campaign,

In any case, Humban-haltash II died in the same year (675) and was succeeded by his brother Urtak.³⁸¹ Early in his reign Urtak sent messengers to conclude a peace agreement (*tūbi u sulummē*) with Esarhaddon³⁸² and then returned to Babylonia some statues of Babylonian deities which had been in Elam.³⁸³ There followed several more years of friendly relations between the two powers, lasting into Ashurbanipal's reign; there is even an indication—far from certain—that during this time Assyrian princes and princesses were being brought up at the Elamite court and young members of the Elamite royal family resided in Nineveh.³⁸⁴ Assyrian-Elamite relations remained peaceful during most of Esarhaddon's reign; Esarhaddon's diplomatic endeavors generally met with more success in Elam than they did in Babylonia.³⁸⁵

Esarhaddon's policies toward Babylonia and her neighbors did not eliminate urban and tribal unrest, but diffused its effects. New leaders of anti-Assyrian movements, such as the Chaldean chieftain Shamash-ibni of the Bit-Dakkuri, were unable to garner widespread support in southern Mesopotamia or to invoke Elamite or Arab assistance from abroad. Consequently Assyria under Esarhaddon had to deal principally with

and the length of reign of Humban-haltash II); and an Elamite invasion seems out of context in Esarhaddon's reign—given the otherwise peaceful relations between the two countries between 690 and 665 and the lack of Assyrian military response either to drive out or later to punish the invaders. Thus textual confusion may be considered as a possible, though less preferable, explanation.

381. For the reading of the name Urtak (without the Akkadian case endings that are used in such Mesopotamian renderings as Urtaku, Urtagi, Urtaku, Urtaki), compare the form in ABL 295:10 and the Elamite place name *u-ir-tak* in Scheil, *MDP* 9 120:7. See also Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 733-734 and Zadok, *Iran* 14 (1976) 63 (latter reference courtesy of M. Stolper).

382. Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 58-59 Episode 19 (name of Urtak not present). The date of the agreement is probably 674 (± 1 year). Urtak came to the throne in 675, and copies of Esarhaddon's Nineveh A inscriptions are dated as early as 673 (though no date is preserved on those texts which actually contain this passage).

383. Babylonian Chronicle iv 17-18 and Esarhaddon Chronicle, lines 21-22 (entries for 674; texts in TCS 5 84, 126); cf. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 25 Episode 36. See also nn. 369 and 379 above.

384. Parpola, *Iraq* 34 (1972) 34 n. 66. This theory is based principally on the interpretation of personal pronominal suffixes in the salutation of ABL 918.

385. This picture may eventually need to be changed as a result of further critical study of the Neo-Assyrian letter corpus; see Frame, *diss.*, pp. 85-87. One should also note Esarhaddon's oracle query as to the sincerity of Urtak (Knudtzon, *Gebete*, no. 76; the date of this text is broken).

localized disruptions rather than with broad-based revolts carried out by urban-trihal coalitions assisted by foreign troops (as had been the case under Sennacherih). Nonetheless political conditions in Bahylonia remained volatile. Reaction to Assyrian rule varied sharply from one locale to another; and, in some places, power oscillated between anti-Assyrian and pro-Assyrian factions. Assyria did not attempt to overwhelm the populace by stationing large garrisons within the cities or by leaving heavy troop concentrations in the countryside; her military control was generally loose and depended on an efficient system of intelligence reports to locate trouble spots and call for outside aid when necessary.³⁸⁶

The political fragmentation of Bahylonia, with its local and vacillating reactions to Assyrian rule, led to internecine as well as anti-Assyrian conflicts. Chaldeans were almost uniformly anti-Assyrian. Thus Nahu-zer-kitti-lishir of Bit-Yakin attacked pro-Assyrian Ur and was put to flight only by the advance of an Assyrian army;³⁸⁷ and Shamash-ihni of Bit-Dakkuri had to be removed because of his penchant for appropriating agricultural land belonging to the inhabitants of Babylon and Borsippa.³⁸⁸ Other trihal leaders were willing to cooperate with the Assyrians: Na'id-Marduk (Bit-Yakin) acted for them as governor of the Sealand, and Bel-iqisha (Gamhulu) agreed to let his city serve as a check on the Elamites.³⁸⁹ Nippur, despite a rapid turnover of governors early in Esarhaddon's reign,³⁹⁰ at one point had a pro-Assyrian administration which frankly admitted to Esarhaddon that the city was detested by its neighbors and in mortal danger because of its Assyrian ties.³⁹¹ Ur at this time was governed by a stable and staunchly pro-Assyrian gubernatorial dynasty, founded by

386. A general outline of the system is presented in *Power and Propaganda*, p. 235.

387. Babylonian Chronicle iii 39-42 (text in *TCS* 5 82); Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 46-48 Episode 4.

388. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 52 Episode 12. Shamash-ihni died in Assyria; and his body was returned to his native land for burial only in the time of Ashur-etel-ilani, about a half century later (YOS 1 43 [= ARAB 2 §§1132-1135]; YOS 9 81-82).

389. Borger, *Asarh.*, p. 47 Episode 4 and pp. 52-53 Episode 13.

390. This includes at least two depositions by Assyria and a year in which three governors held office in quick succession. Sources: chronicle entries for 678 and 675 and perhaps 680 (*TCS* 5 82-84, 126); *CT* 54 22 rev. 10. Note too that the son of a *šandabakku* was said to be in captivity in Assyria (ABL 447.8-10, dated by Parpola c. 670 B.C.; new edition: *LAS* 2 458-459).

391. ABL 327. See the quotation on p. 23 above.

Ningal-iddin;³⁹² its various governors adopted an elevated titulary, and Ningal-iddin himself dated documents by his own regnal years.³⁹³ The governor's office at Ur stayed in this family for more than thirty years and was passed down in succession to at least three of Ningal-iddin's sons.³⁹⁴ But Ur had become a frontier town on the limits of cultivation, serving not only as the local bastion against the Chaldeans of Bit-Yakin but also keeping a close watch on Arah movements to and from the desert;³⁹⁵ its very survival depended on Assyrian favor, and it was fiercely loyal to its benefactors. The Assyrians monitored unrest and potentially disruptive Elamite contacts with Bahylonia,³⁹⁶ although their officials were not always competent in dealing with problems. On at least four occasions during Esarhaddon's reign (680, 678-675, 674), Assyrian military or disciplinary action had to be undertaken against sections of Bahylonia, always at least partly against the Chaldeans and in the final instance specifically against the town of Shamele in Bit-Amukani.³⁹⁷ We have no significant details for any of these operations, perhaps because Esarhaddon's scribes showed an almost Babylonian affinity for recounting

392. There is no evidence either that Ningal-iddin was a Chaldean or that he was removed from office by Esarhaddon (pace *LAS* 2 37). We do not know enough about Ningal-iddin, Shamash-ihni, and Na'id-Marduk in the years between 680 and 678 to be able to interpret ABL 223 (= *LAS* 1 no. 30) plausibly; see the varying interpretations by Parpola, *LAS* 2 35-37 and 516.

393. *Or* 34 (1965) 246 n. 3. *UET* 4 27, 90.

394. *Or* 34 (1965) 246-255; Durand, *RA* 75 (1981) 181-185. Note that one of Ningal-iddin's sons (possibly Sin-balassu-iqbi after he succeeded to the governorship) threatened to block one of the major southern waterways on behalf of Assyrian interests (*CT* 53 75 rev. 14-18 = *LAS* 1 no. 284).

395. *UET* 4 167; cf. Wright in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, p. 333, who points out for post-Kassite times the openness of the area immediately south of Ur to infiltration from the desert.

396. ABL 266-269 (from the reign of Ashurbanipal) and *passim*.

397. *TCS* 5, chronicles 1 and 14. For the identification of Shamele (*Ša-amēle*), see the discussion by Frame, *diss.*, pp. 84-85. The attempt of Fecht, *MDAIK* 16 (1958) 116-119, to place Shamele in Egypt is less than convincing, although the closeness in dates between the defeat of the/an Assyrian army in Egypt (XII-5-674) and the approach to Shamele by the/an Assyrian army (XII-8-674) causes some hesitation in pronouncing an apodictic negative. Parpola, *LAS* 2 35-37, attempts to date the installation of a substitute king in Babylonia in 674 and to connect it both with the Assyrian campaign against Shamele and the revolt of a man named Sallayu; but he later (*ibid.*, p. 516) had second thoughts about the dating of the two principal letters which he had adduced as evidence (ABL 223, 332 = *LAS* 1 nos. 30-31).

his munificence and piety rather than particulars of his campaigning. There are also many tantalizing references in the Assyrian court correspondence to an individual named Sillaya³⁹⁸ fomenting discontent in several sections of Babylonia over these years; but the evidence is still too fragmentary and uncertain to yield more than a sketchy portrait of a revolutionary entrepreneur disconcerting and eluding the Assyrian authorities. At this time, urban Babylonia was generally under Assyrian control, but within broad limits.³⁹⁹

Toward the end of Esarhaddon's reign, events in Egypt and in Assyria came to dominate his attention; and Assyrian affairs eventually had a major impact on Babylonia. Late in 673 Esharra-hamat, the principal wife of Esarhaddon, died.⁴⁰⁰ Two months afterward, with the inevitable realignment of female personnel at court, Esarhaddon designated one of his younger sons, Ashurbanipal, as heir to the Assyrian throne and at the same time named Shamash-shum-ukin as future king of Babylonia.⁴⁰¹ As crown prince Shamash-shum-ukin seems to have taken up residence in lower Mesopotamia and to have served as an administrator there for Esarhaddon.⁴⁰² In these later years of Esarhaddon's reign, increasing use was made of the substitute-king (*šar pūhi*) ritual, whereby commoners

398. At least it has been proposed that the references are to a single person. Dietrich, *AOAT* 7 39-50, lays out a sweeping picture which is in need of detailed critical reexamination.

399. The hinterland seems generally to have been much less under Assyrian domination; cf. also n. 408 below.

Parpola, *LAS* 2 264, suggests that chariotry under the command of the governors of various Babylonian cities took part in Esarhaddon's Egyptian campaign in 671; but this seems unlikely, given the uncertain political conditions in southern Mesopotamia.

400. Babylonian Chronicle iv 22 and Esarhaddon Chronicle, line 23 (the date is given variously as XII-5 and XII-6 in these narratives); texts in TCS 5 65 and 127 (woman's name not given). See also Nassouhi, *MAOG* 3/1-2 (1927) 21-22, and Lambert, *RA* 63 (1969) 65-66. There is no evidence either that Esharra-hamat was Babylonian (*JAOS* 103 [1983] 36 n. 5) or that she was the mother of Shamash-shum-ukin.

401. Wiseman, *Iraq* 20/1 (1958); for the date of the ceremonies, see Cogan, *JCS* 29 (1977) 98-99. The two young princes may be pictured on the side of Esarhaddon's stele from Zinjirli (see *ANEP* nos. 448-449, with literature).

402. The controvertible evidence is summarized by Parpola, *Iraq* 34 (1972) 27; see also *LAS* 2 32, 78-81, 271, 429, and *passim*. There is also an ambiguous statement in a bilingual text of Shamash-shum-ukin which is sometimes interpreted as implying that he or his mother was Babylonian, but there is no clear evidence in favor of either of these possibilities (*JAOS* 103 [1983] 36 n. 5, with earlier literature).

were temporarily installed as surrogates on the Assyrian or Babylonian throne to absorb the effects of evil omens and were then put to death.⁴⁰³ One of these substitute kings was the son of a major Babylonian religious official, and there was considerable unrest in Babylonia after his death.⁴⁰⁴ It is not clear whether Babylonia was involved in the great revolt in Assyria that led to the execution of so many of Esarhaddon's officials in 670.⁴⁰⁵ In any case, we have no knowledge of major anti-Assyrian disruptions in Babylonia between 673 and Esarhaddon's death in 669.⁴⁰⁶

The two decades from 689 to 669 witnessed significant changes in the fortunes of Babylonia. Unfortunately, to reconstruct the political vicissitudes of the time, we are often dependent on the tendentious testimony of Assyrian royal inscriptions; we know only what the chancelleries of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon chose to record. The royal scribes of these two rulers paint sharply contrasting pictures: Babylon in 689 was captured and systematically destroyed, with its gods taken away and their cults suspended, its population dispersed into slavery and their agricultural holdings taken over by triehesmen; Babylon after 681 was revived and rebuilt, with its gods returned and their cults resumed, its population freed and resettled in the city, and its fields reclaimed by their former owners. Neither of these descriptions has been independently verified to a significant extent; and, while there is little reason to doubt the general maltreatment of the city and the removal of the cult statues, there are grounds for suspecting hyperbole in other details.⁴⁰⁷ Nonetheless it seems clear that Babylonia was regarded with unmistakable hostility in the closing years of Sennacherib's reign, that its capital was severely punished and that, some years later, Esarhaddon implemented a policy of

403. Parpola, *LAS* 2A (1971) 54-65; followed by Bottéro, *Akkadica* 9 (1978) 2-24 and more recently Parpola, *LAS* 2 (1983) xxii-xxdii, 35-37, and *passim*.

404. *ABL* 437 (= *LAS* 1 no. 280).

405. Babylonian Chronicle iv 29 and Esarhaddon Chronicle, line 27 (texts in TCS 5 86 and 127). Note the implications of the *ša arki* eponymy dating in *ADD* 499 for the beginning of the year 670 (Larsen, *RA* 68 [1974] 22); see the comments of Parpola, *LAS* 2 238-240, 262, 429, etc. Compare also Dietrich, *AOAT* 7 50-56 and for a contrasting view, *Or* 46 (1977) 312-315.

406. In fact, according to one interpretation of *ABL* 1214 (= *LAS* 1 no. 291, see *LAS* 2 294) Esarhaddon considered making a trip to Borsippa—perhaps his first visit to Babylonia—just a few months before his death.

407. E.g., the thorough physical destruction of the city by Sennacherib which would be expected to leave detectable archeological traces (even with Nebuchadnezzar's later rebuilding). See nn. 322 and 365 above.

reconciliation and did much to repair former ravages. The inhabitants of Babylonia, who seem to have been largely anti-Assyrian in the time of Sennacherib, were in part reconciled to Esarhaddon; and Assyrian rule, while never popular with the bulk of the population,⁴⁰⁸ came to be accepted at least passively in most areas and with enthusiasm by such partisans as Ningal-iddin at Ur, who perceived that his own survival depended on Assyrian favor. Babylonia seems generally to have prospered under the stable government provided by Assyrian rule, commencing a long period of economic growth and benefiting from sponsored construction programs. Discontent was sporadic, local, and readily contained.⁴⁰⁹

408. One wonders at times how firmly most of lower Mesopotamia was under Assyrian control. Note that the conspirators responsible for betraying Ashur-nadin-shumi to the Elamites in 694 were still at large c. 670 after almost two decades of Assyrian rule (*Iraq* 34 [1972] 22).

409. Assyrian campaigning in Babylonia under Esarhaddon was done on a much smaller scale than under Sargon and Sennacherib.

Sibling Monarchs: Shamash-shum-ukin and Ashurbanipal, 669-653 B.C.⁴¹⁰

Esarhaddon's design to divide his royal powers between his sons Ashurbanipal (for Assyria) and Shamash-shum-ukin (for Babylonia) was carried out after his death. Although it is not known whether Esarhaddon had determined in detail the jurisdiction to be exercised by each monarch, it soon turned out that Ashurbanipal not only assumed full control of Assyria and the empire at large but closely supervised Babylonia as well. Shamash-shum-ukin became in fact a dependent monarch, not only subject to Ashurbanipal in the areas of military defense and foreign policy, but also overshadowed in local political and religious matters. Shamash-shum-ukin was obliged to swear an oath of fealty to Ashurbanipal, and his letters to his brother show him accepting a subordinate role.⁴¹¹ Since the relations between the two brothers were eventually to develop into a bloody civil war that would weaken the foundations of the Assyrian empire, it is worth inquiring into the antecedents of their quarrel and scrutinizing the ostensibly peaceful relations during the first sixteen years of their reigns. It is impossible to evaluate hidden reserves of sibling rivalry or fraternal jealousy that may have fueled their animosity;⁴¹² but one can observe patterns of overt action on each side, especially Ashurbanipal's

410. The political history of the period is covered in detail by Frame, *dis.*, pp. 96-115. For substantially varying approaches, one may consult Ahmed, *Southern Mesopotamia in the Time of Ashurbanipal*, and Dietrich, *AOAT* 7 69-85 (with a critique in *Or* 46 [1977] 304-325).

411. Ashurbanipal is mentioned first in the salutations and as "the king," not by personal name; and "my brother" in this case apparently reflects blood relationship, not equal status (*ABL* 426 and 1385; contrast the letters between Assyrian and Elamite rulers: *ABL* 879, 918, and 1151).

412. This would doubtless have been intensified if Shamash-shum-ukin was the elder of the two brothers, as seems to have been the case. Did the rivalry antedate Esarhaddon's death (*ABL* 870)? On the supposed Babylonian origin of Shamash-shum-ukin and his mother, see n. 402 above.

alternating procrastination and interference which must inevitably have caused tension between the brothers.

Ashurbanipal's dilatory conduct seems to have begun soon after his father's death (VIII-10-669 B.C.).⁴¹³ Ashurbanipal succeeded to the throne in the next month,⁴¹⁴ but Shamash-shum-ukin's installation was delayed so long (until late I- or II-668) that his official accession year (668) fell a full year behind that of Ashurbanipal (669).⁴¹⁵ Furthermore, even though the prized statue of Marduk was returned to Babylon at the beginning of Shamash-shum-ukin's reign,⁴¹⁶ major items of its cult furniture were retained in Assyria for at least fourteen years.⁴¹⁷ Ashurbanipal was also slow to move his troops in response to an Elamite invasion of Babylonia,⁴¹⁸ and Assyrian revenge for that invasion was delayed for more than a decade.⁴¹⁹ It is difficult to determine in individual instances whether Ashurbanipal was unable or unwilling to act promptly on Shamash-shum-ukin's behalf; but these incidents were clearly detrimental to Shamash-shum-ukin and as a result he was unlikely to have been more kindly disposed toward Ashurbanipal.

The military defense of Babylonia may have been a continuing source of friction between the brothers. Although Ashurbanipal states that he had given armed forces—including infantry, cavalry, and chariotry—to Shamash-shum-ukin,⁴²⁰ these were insufficient to deal with significant troubles; and Assyria remained essentially responsible for Babylonia's defense.⁴²¹ In 668, when raiders from Kirhit in the eastern mountains were harassing trans-Tigrisian Babylonia (Yamutbal), Assyrian forces had to be sent to the area to crush the offenders.⁴²² But on occasion the quality and

413. Date of death: Babylonian Chronicle iv 31 (TCS 5 86); cf. Esarhaddon Chronicle, line 29 (TCS 5 127).

414. Dated according to the Esarhaddon Chronicle, line 34 (TCS 5 127).

415. Babylonian Chronicle iv 34 (TCS 5 86); Esarhaddon Chronicle, line 35 (TCS 5 127). Cf. Knudtzon, *Cebete*, no. 149 (dated I-23-668).

416. See n. 444 below.

417. Marduk's old bed and new chariot were returned only in 654 and 653 (Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle, lines 4-5; text in TCS 5 129).

418. Specifically Urtak's invasion about 664 B.C.

419. This is discussed in more detail in the succeeding paragraph.

420. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 28.

421. Even to the point of regulating local militia (e.g., ABL 269).

422. Piepkorn, AS 5 48 and parallels. People from Kirbit were subsequently deported to Egypt. Aynard, *Prisme*, p. 18 suggests a possible involvement of Shamash-shum-ukin in this expedition, but there is no textual basis for this.

promptitude of Assyrian defense coverage were not all that was desired. When about 664 the Elamites under Urtak invaded Babylonia,⁴²³ Ashurbanipal delayed dispatching troops until he had received word that the Elamites had spread out over northern Babylonia. Even then the Assyrians did not attempt to punish the local fomenters of the invasion, Nabu-shuma-eresh the governor of Nippur and Bel-iqisha the chief of the Gambulu tribe; they and their descendants escaped Assyrian retribution for more than ten years, until the campaign of 653. Ashurbanipal contemplated an action against the Gambulu as early as 658,⁴²⁴ but this was not undertaken. Thus Babylonia's defense needs were not always well served by Assyrian troops; and perhaps in recognition of that fact, the city walls of both Babylon and Sippar were rebuilt during these years.⁴²⁵

Ashurbanipal intervened actively in Babylonian internal affairs that should have been within the jurisdiction of the Babylonian ruler. In his inscriptions Ashurbanipal claims sole credit for completing his father's reconstruction of the Marduk temple in Babylon, for reestablishing the tax-exemption privileges of Babylon's citizens, and for installing Shamash-shum-ukin as king (Ashurbanipal makes no mention of Esarhaddon's testamentary instructions).⁴²⁶ Ashurbanipal also repaired major sanctuaries in Babylon, Borsippa, Sippar, and Uruk in his own name.⁴²⁷

423. Grayson, ZA 70 (1980) 230, following Walker in Barnett, *North Palace of Ashurbanipal*, p. 6 n. 6, dates this campaign to 667. But Ashurbanipal's texts in fact have conflicting statements: Bauer, *Assurbanipal* 2 56 Rm. 281 implies that Ashurbanipal was on campaign in Egypt when Urtak invaded, whereas Piepkorn, AS 5 56 (the fullest account) places Ashurbanipal in Nineveh at the time. I prefer at least provisionally to date Urtak's invasion and his death in the same year (AS 5 60 iv 58) and to identify this year as 664, when the Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle records the flight of the Elamite (crown) prince to Assyria (text in TCS 5 128). There is also an unpublished economic tablet (NBC 6142) dated under Ashurbanipal at Nippur on V-29-664 (JCS 35 [1983] 21); this is the only text that shows Ashurbanipal in control of the city before 651. For the reading of the name as Urtak, see n. 381 above.

424. Knudtzon, *Cebete*, no. 153; cf. Aro in Nougayrol, ed., *Divination*, p. 117. Cf. ABL 269.

425. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 236-238. Lehmann, *Šamaššumukin* 2 6-9.

426. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 226, etc. Was Ashurbanipal also responsible for installing a substitute king in Babylonia? Cf. ABL 46 (= LAS 1 no. 298) and Parpola's interpretation in LAS 2 305.

Ashurbanipal seems at one time to have claimed the title "viceroys (*sakkanakku*) of Babylon" (Bauer, *Assurbanipal* 2 38 K. 2813+22 and p. 54 D.T. 133.3; additional restored references listed in Seux, *Épithètes*, p. 278); despite the importance of the claim (van Driel, *BiOr* 26 [1969] 368), we are unable to date precisely any of the texts in which the title occurs.

427. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 228-248 (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 146-152, 186, both texts from a later date); Lutz, UCP 9 385-390; UVB 1 60; cf. NBC 2507. Note BM 90864 (ANEP no. 450), a stele portraying Ashurbanipal carrying a basket for the repair of Esagila. See also n. 543 below.

Moreover, Ashurbanipal communicated directly with local officials in Babylonia, who reported to him on internal matters as well as on foreign affairs (especially concerning Elam).⁴²⁸ Despite the nominal allegiance of the Babylonian realm to Shamash-shum-ukin, there were cities such as Uruk and Ur which seemed to be more in touch with the Assyrian than the Babylonian government.⁴²⁹ At Ur, economic texts were dated under Shamash-shum-ukin as king; but Sin-balassu-iqbi, the local governor,⁴³⁰ undertook a massive reconstruction program for the monumental buildings of the city and dedicated his work "for the life of Ashurbanipal" rather than for his nominal sovereign.⁴³¹ Spies resident in Shamash-shum-ukin's capital at Babylon reported to Ashurbanipal on the Babylonian king's activities.⁴³² In fact, for the greater part of Shamash-shum-ukin's reign, it is difficult to determine just what powers he was allowed to exercise as Babylonian king: apart from the use of his name in date formulae, he is known principally for his jurisdiction in cases involving land ownership and water traffic.⁴³³ The only instances of provincial governors being clearly subject to him were Sin-sharra-usur at Ur (who made a dedication for the life of Shamash-shum-ukin)⁴³⁴ and Shula at Dilbat;⁴³⁵ and both of these are poorly attested and may have been appointed only in the days of the civil war (652-648). Although the evidence—and our perspective—may be far from balanced, one gains the impression that Shamash-shum-ukin for most of his reign may have been simply a figurehead.

428. Or 34 (1965) 252-253; Frame, *diss.*, p. 102 (who cites ABL 119, 268, 753, and 839 as examples). These included major provincial and religious officials such as the governor of Uruk and the *satammu* of Eanna. One inevitably wonders to what extent Babylonian contact with Ashurbanipal may simply have been continuing the Babylonian custom of direct contact with Assyrian monarchs before 668.

429. Note too the properties returned by Ashurbanipal to the people of Uruk and to Ninurta (AnOr 9 2), although the precise date within Ashurbanipal's reign is not indicated.

430. Or "viceroy" (*sakkanakku*), as he styles himself. For the titulary of the seventh-century governors of Ur, see p. 17 above.

431. UET 1 168 and 170; UET 8 102. The extensive building program of Sin-balassu-iqbi is discussed in detail in Or 34 (1965) 248-253 and Or 38 (1969) 336-342; new editions of some of his texts may be found in Walker, *CBI* nos. 81-86. Note also the grievance of Shamash-shum-ukin against Sin-balassu-iqbi expressed in ABL 426 (see Durand, RA 75 [1981] 183).

432. ABL 119.

433. BBS^t no. 10. ABL 1385.

434. TCL 12 13 (duplicate: DCEHE 1 pl. 86 no. 144; further bibliography in n. 566 below).

435. ABL 326.

Nonetheless, however nominal his royal power, Shamash-shum-ukin's reign marks a period of increasing economic prosperity and governmental stability in Babylonia. The number of economic texts per year rises significantly beginning in Shamash-shum-ukin's tenth year;⁴³⁶ and the geographical distribution of the texts is impressive, encompassing most major urban centers in the central Mesopotamian floodplain.⁴³⁷ In addition, significant building programs were undertaken at Babylon, Borsippa, Sippar, Uruk, and Ur, possibly supported from Assyrian resources (if Ashurbanipal's sponsorship was more than nominal).⁴³⁸ There is also evidence for considerable scribal activity in both the religious and scientific spheres: composition and editing of prayers and rituals,⁴³⁹ copying of lexical and diagnostic texts,⁴⁴⁰ recording of astronomical observations, and the earliest known astronomical diary text.⁴⁴¹ Regardless of underlying political tensions, the stability in throne tenure from 669 to

436. Years 1-9 of Shamash-shum-ukin (= 667-659 B.C.) average 3.8 texts per year; years 10-16 (= 658-652 B.C.) average 11.7 texts per year. The final years (17-20 = 651-648 B.C.), after the outbreak of the revolt, decline to 7.5 texts per year.

437. Sippar, Cutha, Kish, Babylon, Borsippa, Dilbat, Nippur, Uruk, and Ur. Bibliography of economic texts for the reign: JCS 35 (1983) 25-39. Note the curious alternation of governors at Borsippa as noted by Frame, *diss.*, p. 252 and discussed by him in "The 'First Families' of Borsippa during the Early Neo-Babylonian Period," JCS, forthcoming.

438. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 226-248; ABL 119 (cf. CT 53 60 and LAS 2 283 n. 522); Lehmann, *Samašsumukin* 26-12 (cf. Pinckert, *Hymnen und Gebete an Nebo*, no. 6); Walker, *CBI* no. 77. Note the stone stele BM 90866 (photo in Lehmann, *Samašsumukin* 2, rear plate), which shows Shamash-shum-ukin bearing on his head a basket for temple construction (the mutilation of the crown has been attributed to the action of Ashurbanipal's men after the revolt). Additional references may be found in nn. 427 and 431 above.

439. Combe, *Histoire du culte de Sin en Babylonie et en Assyrie*, no. 6 (= Scheil, *Sippar*, no. 18); Langdon, RA 16 (1919) 67-68 (= Ebeling, *Handerhebung*, pp. 142-143; parallel: AOAT 34 no. 83); PBS 1/1 12, 18 (cf. nos. 13, 14, 17); PBS 1/2 108 (= *Handerhebung*, pp. 66-67), 110 (= *Handerhebung*, pp. 150-153), 119 (cf. *Handerhebung*, pp. 112-115), 120, 124 (cf. nos. 121, 123); PBS 10/2 18; Scheil, *Sippar*, nos. 1, 2 (= *Handerhebung*, pp. 8-9), 6, 18, 36, 59; Schollmeyer, *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen und Gebete an Samaš*, no. 13a (= Scheil, *Sippar*, no. 36). See also Prince, *AJSL* 31 (1914-15) 256-270; Ungnad, *Or* 12 (1943) 293-310; Laessle, *Bit rimki*, pp. 93-98; Parpola, *LAS* 2 164-166 and 351 n. 649. Cf. W. C. Lambert, *Afo* 18 (1957-58) 385-387.

440. VAT 13100 (Erimhuš) and Labat, *TDP*, tablet 12, text C (colophon on p. 110). See also Moren, RA 74 (1980) 190-191.

441. Sachs, *LBAT* 1414-1417 (compendia including lunar eclipses from this time); Sachs in F. R. Hodson, ed., *The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World*, p. 48 and pl. 3 (astronomical diary fragment for 652 B.C.).

653—following as it did the two preceding stable decades—provided a solid foundation for the growth of the Babylonian economy.

The beginning of Shamash-shum-ukin's reign was marked by considerable confusion. First, there was an interregnum prior to his installation; after Esarhaddon's death, the year 669 was not officially ascribed to any king of Babylonia. Economic texts in the latter part of that year were dated according to the accession year of Ashurbanipal,⁴⁴² and later chronological texts assigned it variously to Esarhaddon and Shamash-shum-ukin.⁴⁴³ In II-668 the Marduk statue made a triumphal return from Assur to Babylon; Shamash-shum-ukin and an Assyrian army escorted the statue by boat down the Tigris amidst splendid ceremonies and eventually to Babylon, where various cult images—including Shamash from Sippar, Nergal from Cutha, and Nahu from Borsippa—had gathered to welcome Marduk home.⁴⁴⁴ In the same year, an Assyrian army was sent against the region of Kirbit, which was harassing eastern Babylonia.⁴⁴⁵ In X-668, a "judge of Babylon," one Bel-etir, was executed; but his crime, presumably treason, was not recorded in the chronicles.⁴⁴⁶

It is hard to speak of a distinctive foreign policy for Babylonia in the years 669-653, since Assyria managed foreign relations on behalf of both lands. The former principal allies of Babylonia, the Elamites and Arah, are not known to have had diplomatic contacts with Shamash-shum-ukin during these years; practically nothing is known about the Arah (their major hostilities with Ashurbanipal commence after 652),⁴⁴⁷ and the Elamites were aligned primarily with the Cambulu in opposition to both

442. There are four economic texts from Uruk dated in the "accession year of Ashurbanipal, king of the lands" (listed in *JCS* 35 [1983] 21).

443. The "Ptolemaic Canon" extends Esarhaddon's reign through 668, but Berossos gives Shamash-shum-ukin (Sammuges) a twenty-one-year reign, presumably beginning with 668 (*FCRH* 680 F 7).

444. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 262-268 (cf. the anticipatory text in Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 88-89 and see n. 359 above); chronicle texts in *TCS* 5 86, 127, and 131 (note the divergent day dates). Cf. Mullo-Weir, *JRAS* 1929 553-555 and Ebeling, *Parfümrezepte und kultische Texte aus Assur*, pls. 25-26. Frymer-Kensky, *JAOS* 103 (1983) 131-141, has suggested that the so-called "Marduk Ordeal Text" may date from this time (though she misdates the accession year of Shamash-shum-ukin to 669 [correct to 668]); see the earlier treatments by von Soden, *ZA* 51 (1955) 130-166 and *ZA* 52 (1957) 224-234.

445. See n. 422 above.

446. Babylonian Chronicle iv 38 and Esarhaddon Chronicle, line 39 (texts in *TCS* 5 86 and 127); discussion in Frame, *dis.*, p. 99.

447. Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, pp. 142-169.

the Assyrians and the central government in Babylonia. In this case we should not overinterpret the silence of the texts, since both the Arah and Elamites supported Shamash-shum-ukin after his rebellion had begun.⁴⁴⁸

The history of relations over these years between the three countries Elam, Assyria, and Babylonia is worth reviewing. As noted above, a radical shift in the traditional alignment of Elam and Babylonia versus Assyria took place around 691 B.C. After the battle of Hahule, Babylonia no longer had the support of Elam and was unable to organize effective large-scale resistance against Assyria. With the exception of one or another minor incident of hostilities,⁴⁴⁹ Elam and Assyria generally had peaceable relations during the quarter century between 690 and 665. The high point seems to have been reached when Esarhaddon and Urtak, the Elamite king, entered into a pact around 674. Afterwards in the early 660's, when patterns of severe climatic disruption caused drought in Elam and exceptionally hountiful rainfall in Assyria,⁴⁵⁰ the Assyrians not only sent grain as famine aid to Elam but provided temporary homes in Assyria for hard-pressed Elamites.⁴⁵¹ Assyrian beneficence, however, had no lasting effect; for in 664 Elam unexpectedly turned hostile. The governor of Nippur and the chief of the Cambulu tribe had persuaded Urtak to invade Babylonia. Ashurbanipal, reacting slowly to news of the invasion,⁴⁵² sent out only a reconnaissance mission, which confirmed that the Elamites were in northern Babylonia and that they had set up a camp which menaced Babylon itself. Only then did Ashurbanipal dispatch an army. According to Assyrian sources, the Elamite forces withdrew without resistance and were subsequently defeated as they neared their own land. Before the end of the year Urtak died. A revolution brought a new anti-Assyrian ruler, Teumman, to the Elamite throne and drove the families of Urtak and his

448. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 30-34, 64, and 68.

449. Notably the Elamite raid on Sippar recorded in the Babylonian Chronicle for 675 (see n. 380 above).

450. Piepkorn, *AS* 5 56-58; Streck, *Asb.*, p. 6 (these do not seem to constitute a literary topos). Cf. now Parpola, *LAS* 2 104-105, 301. Sharp climatic fluctuations were always a matter of concern in Mesopotamia, where the ecological balance was fragile; note *LAS* 2 376 rev. 1-2 (in a letter dated to the spring of 657 B.C.) which mentions low rainfall and harvest failure (for Assyria) in the immediately preceding season.

451. *AS* 5 58; Nassouhi, *AfK* 2 (1924-25) 102 col. iii.

452. His inscriptions stress that he was surprised by Elamite treachery (*AS* 5 56-58); in addition, he may have been receiving communications from Elamite officials who opposed Urtak's aggressive policies (*AS* 5 58 iv 40-41, interpretation uncertain; note also the later Neo-Assyrian letter BM 132980 written by Ashurbanipal to the elders of Elam).

predecessor Humban-baltash II into exile at the Assyrian court,⁴⁵³ where they later served as pawns in Assyrian maneuvers to dominate the Elamite monarchy.⁴⁵⁴

Assyria, however, proved unable to punish most of the main actors in this invasion, though it eventually avenged itself on the areas involved. Nabu-shuma-eresb, the governor of Nippur, kept his office⁴⁵⁵ but died soon after of natural causes, as did Bel-iqisha, chief of the Gambulu tribe.⁴⁵⁶ But it was only eleven years afterwards (653) that campaigns against Elam and the Gambulu were undertaken. At that time an Assyrian army invaded Elam, defeated and killed Teumman in a battle at Tell Tuba on the Eulaeus river, and installed in his place two Elamite princes who had been in exile at the Assyrian court.⁴⁵⁷ Then the Assyrians proceeded against the Gambulu, decimating their land and removing Dunanu and Samgunu, two of Bel-iqisha's sons, for punishment in Assyria.⁴⁵⁸

At this point, just before the civil war broke out, Assyria should have been in a strong position. It had recently crushed Elam and Gambulu, two of the major trouble spots in the southeast, and had divided jurisdiction in Elam between two princes who had lived in Assyria for more than a decade. But the flaw this time lay in central Babylonia: Shamash-shum-ukin was not content with his subordinate role nor with Ashurbanipal's interference and inadequate defense policies. His resolution to set an independent course was to have fateful consequences both for Babylonia and for the Assyrian empire.

453. Presumably to be connected with these events is the notice in the Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle, lines 2-3 that on VII-12-664 "the (crown) prince of Elam fled [to] Assyria" (text in TCS 5 128; discussion by Millard, *Iraq* 26 [1964] 19). For Teumman, see Stolper, "Political History," p. 50.

454. This Elamite invasion and its aftermath are recounted in detail in AS 5 56-60. Many Elamites were said to have gone into exile with the Elamite princes.

455. Note, however, that an economic text dated at Nippur on V-29-664 cites Ashurbanipal rather than Shamash-shum-ukin as king (JCS 35 [1983] 21). The Nippur governorship passed within the next few years to the pro-Assyrian Enlil-bani (the religious text BM 78903 mentions him as governor on X-15-661; cf. RA 77 [1983] 175 n. 4 and JCS 35 [1983] 39 Kn.9).

456. AS 5 60. A third conspirator, Marduk-shuma-ibni, an official (*šūt rēš*) in Elam, died about the same time of unspecified causes.

457. Humban-nikash II at Susa and Madaktu and Tammaritu I at Haidalu (Hidalu). AS 5 60-70, Weidner, *Afo* 8 (1932-33) 178ff. epigraphs nos. 5-17, 30-33, 35, etc.; Aynard, *Prisme*, pp. 38-40. Cf. the text dated at URU *Ha-a-da-lu* in the accession year of Tammaritu (Leichty, *AnSt* 33 [1983] 153-155); and also Stolper, "Political History," p. 50.

458. AS 5 70-76; cf. *Afo* 8 (1932-33) 182-186 epigraphs nos. 18-26, 29, 34, 36-38; Aynard, *Prisme*, pp. 40-42.

PART VI

The Great Rebellion (652-648 B.C.) and Its Aftermath: Shamash-shum-ukin and His Allies versus Ashurbanipal⁴⁵⁹

In the middle of the seventh century, a bitter struggle between the two most prominent members of the Assyrian royal family shook the base of the Assyrian empire. Shamash-shum-ukin led Babylonia in a full-scale rebellion against Ashurbanipal and won support from Elam, Arabia, and elsewhere in western Asia.⁴⁶⁰ Assyrian military energies were absorbed for four years in dealing with the revolt in urban Babylonia and then for several additional years in cleaning up pockets of resistance in the Sealand and exacting vengeance from Babylonia's foreign supporters. These massive military efforts severely strained the resources of the Assyrian empire, for in its final three decades (after 640 B.C.) it launched few if any significant initiatives. It is the purpose of the present section to describe the events of this revolt, which formed a watershed in Mesopotamian political history.

To assess the impact of the rebellion on Assyria, we should be better informed of the empire's status circa 653 B.C., just before the outbreak of hostilities. It seems likely that Assyrian power had already begun to decline after the early years of Ashurbanipal. Assyria's control over Egypt had been slipping since about 660, Gimmerians were menacing Syria by 657,⁴⁶¹ and some associated states such as Lydia had renounced their connections with Assyria.⁴⁶² A major difficulty in interpreting the history of

459. The political and military events of this period are discussed in detail by Frame, *diss.*, pp. 115-168. For different reconstructions of the history, one may consult Ahmed, *Southern Mesopotamia in the Time of Ashurbanipal*, and Dietrich, *AOAT* 7 85-125 (with criticism in *Or* 46 [1977] 304-325).

460. The possibility that Manasseh of Judah may have supported the revolt is raised by 2 Chronicles 33:11-13.

461. For this interpretation, see Parpola, *LAS* 2 307-308.

462. The exact date when Gyges broke off association with Assyria has been much debated; see Cogan and Tadmor, *Or* 46 (1977) 65-85.

Ashurbanipal's reign is that reconstruction of the sequence of events often depends on vague statements in documents with little or no chronological perspective. We simply do not know how weak the Assyrian empire may have been, especially in the west, by around 653 B.C.;⁴⁶³ and this seriously diminishes our ability to appraise events from a regional perspective.

In Part V above, we discussed the background for Shamash-shum-ukin's discontent, i.e., Ashurbanipal's interference in Babylonian internal affairs and his inadequate military protection of the realm. When this was added to the general restlessness of Babylonia under the Assyrian yoke (evident from the preceding decades of political turmoil), it provided the occasion for concerted rebellion by the local population and their Assyrian-horn leader. Whether there was a single cause which sparked the conflagration, such as Ashurbanipal's Elamite-Cambulu campaign(s) of 653 or his rumored plans for treating Babylon more harshly,⁴⁶⁴ we do not know. In any case, Shamash-shum-ukin's intention to raise the standard of rebellion had become known by II-23-652 B.C.; for on that date Ashurbanipal wrote to the citizens of Babylon in a standard Assyrian maneuver to detach them from allegiance to their king.⁴⁶⁵

Although Ashurbanipal weighed the possibility of a quick move into Babylon as early as IV-17-652,⁴⁶⁶ almost eight months were to elapse between the discovery of Shamash-shum-ukin's plot and the formal outbreak of hostilities (X-19-652).⁴⁶⁷ One of the reasons for the delay may have been that Ashurbanipal could not count on the wholehearted support of Assyria (where there may have been insurrections in the very next year, 651).⁴⁶⁸ By the time that battle was joined in Babylonia between the forces

463. See now J. Elayi, *RA* 77 (1983) 45-58, for a discussion of the relationship of the Phoenician cities to the Assyrian empire in the time of Ashurbanipal. For a suggestion that the Cimmerians were in control of Syria in 657, see Parpola, *LAS* 2.308 (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 375-377). For a *ša arki* eponymy dating (III-17-651) on a text found at Gezer, see Pinches, *PEFQS* 1904.229-236 (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 207-208, 236-244) and Larsen, *RA* 68 (1974) 22-23.

464. *ABL* 301 (= Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia*, pp. 169-170 no. 115).

465. *Ibid.* Similar occurrences in earlier decades: *NL* 1 (Saggs, *Iraq* 17 [1955] 23-24); 2 Kings 18:17-37. Compare Piepkorn, *AS* 5.58 iv 40-41 (Elamite magnates deal directly with Ashurbanipal) and n. 452 above.

466. Klauber, *PRT* 102.

467. *Akitu Chronicle*, line 11 (text in *TCS* 5.131).

468. *Akitu Chronicle*, line 17 (text in *TCS* 5.132; restoration and translation not entirely certain, but compare line 25 of the chronicle). It is equally possible that Ashurbanipal was assembling troops or making efforts toward a diplomatic solution. It has also been suggested that Assyrian forces may still have been engaged in the Elamite-Cambulu campaign (usually

of Ashurbanipal and Sbamash-shum-ukin, the lines of adherence to the two monarchs seem to have been clearly drawn.⁴⁶⁹ Shamash-shum-ukin could rely on the cities of northern and central Babylonia (with the possible exception of Cutha)⁴⁷⁰ as well as on Chaldean and Aramean tribal areas, with exceptions in the far south to be noted presently. The Assyrians had their chief support in the non-tribal urban south—Uruk, Ur, Kissik, Kullab, Eridu, and Shat-iddin—plus a few local tribal adherents such as the Curasimmu and some Puqudu. We do not know who had the support of the countryside in northern Babylonia; forces from both sides marched through it apparently without opposition, and it may have been effectively neutralized by its open and vulnerable position. To some extent this line-up within Babylonia reflects longstanding pro- and anti-Chaldean sentiment, with the principal opposition coming from southern cities which were enclaves struggling to survive in a predominantly Chaldean landscape.⁴⁷¹

Outside Babylonia, the Elamites and Arahms seem generally to have supported the cause of Shamash-shum-ukin, occasionally to the extent of participating in the fighting.⁴⁷² Ashurbanipal claimed that Shamash-shum-ukin had induced the "kings of Cutium, Amurru, and Meluhha" (archaic names for such places as the middle Zagros, northern Syria, and Egypt-Nubia) to rebel and side with the Babylonian king,⁴⁷³ but we have no independent evidence that any of these regions actively assisted the Babylonian effort. Foreign support does not seem to have been a significant factor in determining the outcome or even the course of the

dated to 653). Unfortunately we do not know the significance of the chronicle statement that from month II to month X in 652, *rab bīti ina māt Akkadī biḫirti ibteḫir* (*Akitu Chronicle*, line 10; text in *TCS* 5.131). As stated above in n. 375, there is no clear evidence that this phrase refers to the conscription of troops.

469. For Babylonian economic texts dated under Shamash-shum-ukin and Ashurbanipal between 652 and 648, see *JCS* 35 (1983) 21-22 and 32-36.

470. Cutha is not mentioned among the initial northern rebel cities in Streck, *Asb.*, p. 30 iii 107 and had to be captured later by Shamash-shum-ukin's forces (Shamash-shum-ukin *Chronicle*, lines 7-10, with significant restorations; text in *TCS* 5.129).

471. To magnify the extent of the Assyrian victory, Ashurbanipal's official inscriptions (e.g., Streck, *Asb.*, p. 30) fail to mention pro-Assyrian elements among the population in Babylonia and give the impression that the land was united behind Shamash-shum-ukin. For the possibility that Ashurbanipal's loyal troops included Babylonians (UR1.KI), Chaldeans, and Arameans (LÜ *ah-lam-i*), see Klauber, *PRT* 105.

472. E.g., Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 30-34, 64, 68, Piepkorn, *AS* 5.76, Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, pp. 153-156.

473. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 30. See also nn. 460 and 463 above.

fighting, except in so far as Elam assisted Chaldean dissidents in prolonging hostilities in the southeast for more than a year after the fall of Babylon and the death of Sbamash-sbum-ukin.

The principal actions of the war may be divided into two theaters, north and south. In each of these regions, from 652 to 648, major urban areas were particularly vulnerable and often under attack. Their hinterlands eventually came under enemy control and, though urban defenders could hold out under siege-like conditions—for periods of two years or more in such cities as Ur and Babylon—isolated cities were clearly at a disadvantage in these long drawn-out fights. In the north, after hostilities commenced on X-19-652,⁴⁷⁴ Sbamash-shum-ukin's forces were quickly checked; in less than three weeks (XI-8-652), he was forced to make a strategic withdrawal into Babylon "in front of the enemy."⁴⁷⁵ The Babylonian decline, however, was only temporary. In the next month there were two major battles between the Assyrian and Babylonian armies; in the latter of these, at Hirit in the province of Sippar on XII-27-652, the Babylonian army suffered a serious defeat.⁴⁷⁶ Early in the war, Elamite troops sent to help Shamash-sbum-ukin were defeated at Mankisu (on the Tigris near modern Baghdad);⁴⁷⁷ and Arab troops arrived in Babylon, probably in 651 or the first months of 650.⁴⁷⁸ Despite setbacks in early engagements, the Babylonian army continued to fight actively in both urban and rural areas⁴⁷⁹ and on VIa-9-651 succeeded in capturing Cutha.⁴⁸⁰

474. The generic statement in the Akitu Chronicle, "Month Tebetu, nineteenth day: Assyria and Akkad became hostile [*inakktrū*, written KÜR MEŠ]" (line 11; text in TCS 5 131), gives no indication as to the character of the opening hostilities.

475. Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle, line 6; cf. the Akitu Chronicle, line 12 (texts in TCS 5 129, 131). Shamash-shum-ukin's control over the hinterland of Babylon remained weak, and the New Year's Festival with its procession outside the city walls was omitted each year from 651 to 648, inclusive.

476. Sachs in F. R. Hodson, ed., *The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World*, p. 48 and pl. 3 (BM 32312, astronomical diary); Akitu Chronicle, lines 13-15 (text in TCS 5 132). The battle of Hirit is fully discussed in Frame, *diss.*, pp. 266-270.

477. AS 5 76. For the possibility that the battle at Mankisu may have been identical with one of the two battles in XII-652, see Frame, *diss.*, Appendix C. For the location(s) of Mankisu, see the summary of discussions in Nashef, *RGTC* 5 183.

478. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 68. For the date, see Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, p. 154.

479. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 32.

480. Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle, lines 7-10 (text in TCS 5 129). ABL 1117 is to be connected with this episode (context in Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, pp. 153-154).

But within a few months (before the end of XI-651) the Assyrians gained Nippur in central Babylonia,⁴⁸¹ and an Assyrian army put Babylon itself under siege on IV-11-650.⁴⁸² Thus, in the northern theater, most military action in the field took place in an eighteen-month period between X-652 and IV-650; after that time the Assyrians were in control of the countryside and had settled down to reducing urban strongholds such as Babylon, Borsippa, Cutha, and Sippar by siege.

The early course of the war in the south may have been similar, but there it was the pro-Assyrian cities that were under attack. (It should be noted that most available evidence concerning the southern theater comes from letters and their chronological vagueness permits many possible interpretations.) Uruk, Kullab, Ur, Kissik, Eridu, and a few other cities seem early to have declared their adherence to Ashurbanipal;⁴⁸³ but only Uruk seems to have been reinforced with Assyrian troops to the extent that it was never in serious danger from Chaldean forces and the generally hostile countryside. In fact, Uruk seems to have served as a staging area for Ashurbanipal's forces in the south; and the Assyrian governors of Arrapha, Labiru, and Zame exercised military commands there.⁴⁸⁴ Early in the war, the Sealanders⁴⁸⁵ and the Puqudu tribe controlled the south and seriously pressed the pro-Assyrians; Eridu, Kullab, and the Gurasimmu tribe eventually defected to the side of Shamash-sbum-ukin.⁴⁸⁶ Ur under its governor Sin-tabni-usur found itself in dire straits, but held out against

481. 2 NT 281 and 282 (= IM 57901 and 57902) are dated at Nippur under Ashurbanipal on XI-18-651 (his eighteenth regnal year).

482. Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle, line 19 (text in TCS 5 130). The siege is confirmed by an economic text dated at Babylon on VIII-13-650 (San Nicolò, *BR* 8/7 no. 19, with further bibliography in *JCS* 35 [1983] 34 under K.119).

483. Economic texts are dated under Ashurbanipal as early as II-15-651 at Uruk (Hunger, *Bagh. Mitt.* 5 [1970] 205-206 and 277 no. 5). One should also note the possibility that Ur may have been closely linked to Shamash-shum-ukin just before or at the commencement of hostilities, since the short-lived governor Sin-sharra-usur of the Ningal-iddin family made a dedication at Uruk for the life of Shamash-shum-ukin (*TCL* 12 13, dupl. *DCEHE* 1 pl. 86 no. 144; see n. 566 below); but it is not impossible that the text could be placed later and connected with a crisis at Uruk of which we are presently unaware.

484. ABL 754+CT 54 250, ABL 543, 1108. Cf. ABL 1028. The Assur Ostrakon (KAI no. 233; TSSI 2 20) may also date from Uruk about this time.

485. The name seems at this time to designate primarily members of the Chaldean tribe of Bit-Yakin.

486. ABL 1241+CT 54 112.

famine and the enemy for at least two years.⁴⁸⁷ Eventually a letter was dispatched to Ashurbanipal pleading for troops and warning that the wealth which his ancestors had bestowed on the temple of Sin, patron deity of Ur, would fall into enemy hands.⁴⁸⁸ Legal texts found at Ur and dated in 650 and 649 show men selling property rights and a prebend to raise money for food.⁴⁸⁹ Ur was subjected to extreme stress, and a damaged letter suggests that Sin-tabni-usur may have been forced to submit to Shamash-shum-ukin before relief came.⁴⁹⁰ But, if Ur actually was lost, this was only for a brief period; Assyrian troops eventually arrived with the governor of Uruk to rescue the city.⁴⁹¹

As noted above, the southern theater of war was dominated at first by tribal forces, especially the Sealander and the Puqudu. The Sealander was under the control of Nabu-bel-shumati, a grandson of Merodach-baladan, who was a symbol of anti-Assyrian resistance from early in the revolt⁴⁹² until his death five years later.⁴⁹³ The Sealander and Puqudu were closely allied with Elam; they drew military support from there, occasionally conducted raids from Elamite bases, and eventually—after the Assyrians had gained the upper hand in southern Babylonia—made Elam their permanent refuge.⁴⁹⁴ Nabu-bel-shumati was allied with four

487. ABL 290 (translation not beyond question). The possibility that there may have been even a third year is raised by ABL 523 (context uncertain). Note the oracular query by Ashurbanipal about the continuing loyalty of Sin-tabni-usur (Klauber, *PRT* 129; cf. *ibid.*, no. 135, oracle sought before the appointment of Sin-tabni-usur).

488. ABL 1241+CT 54 112.

489. BM 113929 (dated at Nina III-23-650) and BM 113928 (dated at Ur 1-29-649). In both texts Sin-tabni-usur, governor of Ur, was the chief witness; there was also some question as to whether one of the participants in the first transaction would be able to reach Ur. See *Or* 38 (1969) 343.

490. ABL 1274 (interpretation uncertain).

491. ABL 754+CT 54 250 (interpretation uncertain).

492. Nabu-bel-shumati had previously been a vassal of Ashurbanipal and had been sent Assyrians to assist him (Streck, *Asb.*, p. 130; cf. p. 142). But an oracle query dated I-4-651 (Klauber, *PRT* 105) mentions him as already in revolt. The Assyrians considered him one of the three major leaders of the rebellion, as may be seen from his mention along with Shamash-shum-ukin and the king [of Elam] in *PRT* 139. See Frame, *diss.*, p. 154, and Malbran-Labat, *JA* 263 (1975) 7-37.

493. For the capture and death of Nabu-bel-shumati, see ABL 879 and Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 60-62.

494. The conduct of the Puqudu and the Sealander at this time is discussed in Frame, *diss.*, chapter 4 section 4. See also ABL 942 and 1241+CT 54 112.

Elamite kings, Humban-nikash II, Tammartu, Indabibi, and Humban-haltash III,⁴⁹⁵ who ruled in quick succession; the first three of them were deposed in revolts, but each new king sooner or later embraced the tradition of opposition to Assyria. Nabu-bel-shumati seems to have been unusually successful in his anti-Assyrian maneuvers; the frequent occurrence of his name joined with slanderous epithets in the Assyrian court correspondence indicates not only his crucial role in undermining the Assyrian cause in the south, but also the violent antipathy which he aroused in his opponents.⁴⁹⁶ To stem the tide, Ashurbanipal in the middle of the war (II-5-650) sent Bel-ibni, the son of a former Babylonian official, as military commander to the Sealand.⁴⁹⁷ He struggled bitterly—if not always successfully—against Nabu-bel-shumati; but, after Assyria had gained the upper hand in the north and had the major cities there under siege, Ashurbanipal's cause came to prevail in the south as well.⁴⁹⁸ By the second half of 649, legal documents were being dated under Ashurbanipal in parts of Bit-Amukani and Bit-Dakkuri.⁴⁹⁹

We do not know the sequence of events that led to the collapse of the revolt in either the north or the south. Babylon, Borsippa, Cutha, and Sippar continued under siege—Babylon itself for more than two years—with food ever scarcer and plague becoming endemic.⁵⁰⁰ During this time, Arab auxiliaries who were serving in Babylon under Abiyate⁵ and Ayamu fought their way out of the besieged town, but suffered heavy losses.⁵⁰¹ The last known documents dated under Shamash-shum-ukin come from

495. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 60. For the reading of the name as Indabibi (rather than Indabigash), see n. 506 below.

496. At least in part because of his renounced vassalage to Ashurbanipal.

497. ABL 289.

498. It was perhaps at this point that at least part of Bit-Amukani came under Ashurbanipal's control (Klauber, *PRT* 139).

499. BM 118982 is dated at Sha-suru-Adad (= Issur-Adad?) on VIII-27-649; *AnOr* 94 v 48-vi 46 is dated at Iluk on XII-1-649.

500. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 32. There are also numerous economic texts dated at Babylon and Borsippa during the siege which mention the straitened circumstances, e.g., San Nicolò, *BR* 8/7 no. 19; Oppenheim, *Iraq* 17 (1955) 77 and n. 26; Pinches, *JTVI* 26 (1893) 163; Unger, *Babylon*, pp. 303-304 no. 34. Assyrian accounts portray the wretched state of the city, including the extremities of famine which led to cannibalism (Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 36-40; Thompson, *Iraq* 7 [1940] 107-108 no. 34; Knudsen, *Iraq* 29 [1967] 55-57; Cogan and Tadmor, *Or* 50 [1981] 229-240; Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, p. 154).

501. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 68; Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, pp. 154-156.

Babylon and Borsippa in the summer of 648;⁵⁰² within the next few months the northern cities fell and Shamash-shum-ukin perished in the conflagration at Babylon.⁵⁰³ Ashurbanipal reimposed his rule over the land and removed the surviving urban population of Cutha and Sippar to the capital city.⁵⁰⁴

After the suppression of rebellion in the north in 648, fighting in the south may have continued. Nabu-bel-shumati remained at large until 646;⁵⁰⁵ and—although details are far from clear—he seems to have been harassing the Assyrian side either from headquarters in the southeast or from refuge in Elam. Elam continued to be a major problem for Assyria. After the defeat and death of Teumman at the hands of the Assyrians in 653, Ashurbanipal had apportioned the rule of Elam between two monarchs, Humban-nikash II (with capitals at Madaktu and Susa) and Tammariu I (with his capital at Haidalu), both exiled princes who had been living at the

502. BM 134973 (Borsippa, V-28-648) and BM 40577 (Babylon, V-30-648). It is presumed that Babylon fell before the end of 648, since this was the last year for which the Akitu Chronicle records that the New Year's Festival could not be celebrated because of the war (TCS 5 132:23) and economic texts are dated by Kandalanu's first year in 647 (JCS 35 [1983] 39). If Parpola's hypothesis is correct about the despoiling of Babylonian literary tablets after the end of the civil war in the north (JNES 42 [1983] 11), then Babylon may have fallen by XI-1-648; but the evidence is indirect and not beyond question.

It has not been established at what time or times during Ashurbanipal's long association with Babylonia (from at least 669 to 627) tablets were collected for his palace library from Borsippa and elsewhere (CT 22 1; cf. Elat, *BiOr* 39 [1982] 5).

503. There is no clear evidence that Shamash-shum-ukin committed suicide. Von Soden, ZA 62 (1972) 85, suggests that at the fall of Babylon Shamash-shum-ukin may have met his end by being pushed into the flames by a subordinate; but this does not seem a necessary inference from the texts (ABL 972; Streck, *Asb.*, p. 36, etc.), though it is a possible interpretation. Barnett, *North Palace of Ashurbanipal*, labels a relief from the throne room (Room M) of this palace as "The King in his Chariot Receiving the Surrender of Shamash-shum-ukin"; but the epigraph states only that the royal garments and other paraphernalia of Shamash-shum-ukin (plus his officials, his harem, other palace personnel, etc.) were paraded before Ashurbanipal—nothing is stated about the Babylonian king himself. This is confirmed in any case by the representation on the relief (*ibid.*, pl. XXXV), which depicts officials carrying the royal crown and scepter to be handed over to the victorious Assyrians (Barnett, *ibid.*, p. 16 implies that the surrender of Shamash-shum-ukin was posthumous).

504. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 40. The Rassam Cylinder speaks only of conditions in Babylon, Cutha, and Sippar at the end of the revolt, omitting Borsippa from its account; contrast the enumeration of all four cities at the beginning of the siege (*ibid.*, p. 32). It is also possible that it was at this time or shortly thereafter that Ashurbanipal deported people from Uruk and Babylon into Samaria (Ezra 4:9-10).

505. ABL 879.

Assyrian court. This division may have further destabilized what was already a highly volatile political environment. Humban-nikash was overthrown by Tammariu II, who was in turn dethroned by Indabibi;⁵⁰⁶ and fled to the Assyrian court. Indabibi was killed and replaced by Humban-haltash III. These three revolutions took place in less than five years; and, as noted above, each new king—regardless of previous Assyrian benefactions—came eventually to support the Babylonian rebels against Ashurbanipal.⁵⁰⁷

Thus, after reducing the cities of northern Babylonia, Ashurbanipal turned his attention to the next most troublesome region, southeastern Babylonia and western Elam. Probably in 647 and 646, the Assyrian army conducted at least two campaigns reaching widely into Elam. The first of these punitive expeditions began in Aramean territory in the eastern borderlands of Babylonia. Several prominent tribal towns there, including Hilimmu and Pillatu, submitted voluntarily rather than face a full-scale Assyrian assault. The Assyrian army then marched to Bit-Imbi, a local capital in western Elam, captured, and despoiled it. Humban-haltash fled from Madaktu into the highlands; and Ashurbanipal set up Tammariu II again as king in Susa. Tammariu expressed his objections to the plundering of Elam by Assyrian armies and promptly lost his throne.⁵⁰⁸ Ashurbanipal claimed to have concluded this campaign with the capture, spoliation, and destruction of most of the major cities of western Elam, including Susa, Madaktu, and Dur-Untash; but, since some of these cities were still flourishing on the occasion of his next campaign, his scribes may have been indulging in Assyrian narrative license.⁵⁰⁹

In the second campaign, Assyrian troops ranged widely over western Elam, conquering and supposedly devastating extensive areas but never

506. To be read thus rather than Indabigash on the basis of the Persepolis writing of Elamite Indapiti in Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (OIP 92), p. 702. I owe this suggestion to M. Stolper and E. Reiner.

507. The Elamite troubles are treated in passing in Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 26, 32-36, 142-144; cf. Aynard, *Prisme*, pp. 40-44.

508. Whether because of deposition by Ashurbanipal or as the result of a revolution is not stated in the sources. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 44-46; Aynard, *Prisme*, p. 46 (the translation referring to Tammariu's objections is uncertain). Ashurbanipal's inscriptions conveniently ascribe the action to the agency of the gods.

509. The principal connected narratives dealing with this campaign may be found in Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 40-46 and Aynard, *Prisme*, pp. 44-48. For the date of this and the following campaign, the observations by Tadmor (*ICO* 25, vol. 1, pp. 240-241), are now generally accepted.

managing to engage in battle with Humban-haltash, who once again escaped to the highlands. In his anger, Ashurbanipal decided to make an object lesson of Susa, the venerable political and religious capital. He took up residence there in the royal palace and stripped it of treasure, furniture, vehicles, and animals. He had his soldiers destroy the temples and sanctuaries, pull down the ziggurat, and set fire to the sacred groves reserved for secret rites. The Assyrians took away the cult images of the principal gods and goddesses, their priests and sacred vessels, and the statues of earlier Elamite kings. They also desecrated the tombs of former monarchs:

I exposed (them) to the sun and took their bones away to Assyria. I imposed restlessness upon their shades (and) deprived them of food-offerings and of people to pour libations for them.⁵¹⁰

Ashurbanipal then proceeded to devastate the Elamite plain, destroying cities, deporting the population, and driving off to Assyria the vast flocks of animals that constituted Elam's chief source of wealth. He sowed salt and thorn-bearing plants over the fields and returned the land to a primeval state:

In a month of days I levelled the whole of Elam. I banished from its fields the sound of human voices, the tramp of cattle and sheep, the refrain of joyous harvest songs. I turned it into a pasture for wild asses, gazelles, and all manner of wild animals.⁵¹¹

The effect was decisive. Elam was never again a major political power, though Humban-haltash and other highland rulers would continue to prove a minor annoyance to Assyria.⁵¹²

But, in the short term, Humban-haltash in his devastated capital at Madaktu⁵¹³ agreed to comply with the wishes of Ashurbanipal and to extradite Nahu-bel-shumati. The latter, preferring to evade the grisly fate

510. Aynard, *Prisme*, p. 56:52-54. This is not the only occasion on which Ashurbanipal attempted to avenge himself upon the dead.

511. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 56-58 vi 99-106.

512. The principal connected narratives for the second Elamite campaign may be found in Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 46-60 and Aynard, *Prisme*, pp. 48-60. Note, however, that Elam continued to exist as a political entity, albeit on a modest scale, in the late seventh and sixth centuries. On the destruction of Susa and the later history of Elam, see Stolper, "Political History," pp. 52-59.

513. Perhaps to be identified with Tepe Patak (de Miroschedji, *DAFI* 12 [1981] 174, with earlier bibliography).

accorded most notorious anti-Assyrian leaders, had himself slain by his personal attendant (*kizû*). Humban-haltash, fearing Ashurbanipal's further displeasure, packed the body in salt and dispatched it to Nineveh.⁵¹⁴

A direct benefit to Babylonia from Ashurbanipal's Elamite campaigns was the return of a statue of the goddess Nanaya from Susa to its original home in Uruk. When the statue had been removed, we do not know; the texts of Ashurbanipal mention that it had been absent for 1,635 years; but such figures are usually exaggerated.⁵¹⁵

After Ashurbanipal's revenge on Elam, the last target of retribution remaining from the days of the Great Rebellion was the dissident Arab tribes in the western desert. In 645 or shortly thereafter,⁵¹⁶ in order to punish these tribes both for their assistance to Shamash-shum-ukin and for their continuing raids on Assyrian territories (probably on the middle Euphrates and in the neighborhood of Palmyra), Ashurbanipal launched a lengthy and arduous summer campaign—designed to catch the nomads and their animals in the season when they would have to remain closest to their water supplies.⁵¹⁷ The Assyrians pursued a strategy of quick marches and seizure of critical oases and watering points. Some of the Arab chieftains, notably Abiyate⁵ and Ayamû, surrendered. Uaite⁵, chief of the Qedarites, was deposed and banded over to the Assyrians by his own people; and a later campaign resulted in the submission of the Nahayatu.⁵¹⁸ Thus not only were pro-Babylonian actions punished, but the desert frontier was at least temporarily quieted.

Thus the Great Rebellion and its aftermath occupied the Assyrians for at least seven years, and the Assyrian royal inscriptions record no great campaign conducted thereafter by the imperial armies. Although Assyria had succeeded in recapturing Babylonia and in disciplining Babylonia's

514. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 60-62, which narrates the fate of Nabu-bel-shumati after the conclusion of Ashurbanipal's second campaign against Humban-haltash. Contrast the letter ABL 879 (dated IV-26-eponymy of Nabu-shar-ahhe[shu], now usually equated with 646 B.C.) written from Humban-haltash to Ashurbanipal, in which the Elamite king states: "I have laid hold of Nabu-bel-shumati; I have sent him to you"; this text does not refer to the Chaldean leader as dead.

Note also ABL 281, as explicated by Stolper, *ZA* 68 (1978) 261-269. See Stolper, "Political History," pp. 51-52.

515. Streck, *Asb.*, p. 58; Aynard, *Prisme*, p. 58.

516. For the date, see Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, p. 157.

517. Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 64-80; Eph'al, *Ancient Arabs*, pp. 157-165.

518. The Nabayatu and particularly Natnu, their sheikh, had been in contact with Shamash-shum-ukin. Cf. ABL 1117.

allies on both the Elamite plain and the Arahian desert, these actions had entailed disproportionate expenditures of time, manpower, and financial resources. Assyria had reasserted its hegemony; but the empire had declined in both power and geographical extent, and the protracted struggle had drawn attention to Assyrian vulnerability. More serious was the fact that, in decimating Elam, Ashurbanipal had removed a buffer state which had insulated Assyria from strong tribal groups in the Iranian interior.⁵¹⁹ The next enemies of the empire which arose in southwest Iran and southern Babylonia would be more formidable and would not repeat their predecessors' mistakes.

519. Note, however, that Ashurbanipal claimed that some of these more distant Iranians, including Kurash of Parsumash (= Cyrus of Persia?), initially accepted his suzerainty and sent tribute (Weidner, *Afo* 7 [1931-32] 4).

Kandalanu and the Decline of Assyrian Power, 647-626 B.C.

The two decades of the reign of Kandalanu (647-627) mark a period of relative quiet in Babylonia between two major anti-Assyrian upheavals. During the early years of this time, probably before 640, Ashurbanipal's armies were occupied in settling scores with the principal foreign supporters of Shamash-shum-ukin's rebellion, that is the Elamites and Arabs.⁵²⁰ For the later years there were no major military campaigns recorded by Assyria; and this silence has generally been interpreted as indicating a decline in Assyrian strength. The history of Babylonia during this time must at present be reconstructed almost entirely from economic texts (administrative and legal); very little is known about political history.⁵²¹

Kandalanu himself is practically unknown.⁵²² Although he presided over Babylonia for twenty-one years at a time during which the country fully regained its economic strength, his name is known only from chronological texts (kinglists and a chronicle)⁵²³ and from date formulae in documents referring to his reign.⁵²⁴ There is no contemporary evidence about his origin⁵²⁵ or about any action that he took as king.⁵²⁶ Because he is such a

520. These campaigns are discussed in Part VI above.

521. The period has been treated in detail by Frame, *diss.*, pp. 168-179. Note too the Babylonian Saturn observations mentioned by Walker, *BSMS* 5 (1983) 20-21.

522. *RLA* 5 368.

523. The sole chronicle passage mentioning Kandalanu uses him merely as a chronological referent: "after Kandalanu" (*Akitu Chronicle*, line 24; text in *TCS* 5 132).

524. *JCS* 35 (1983) 39-51.

525. Some centuries later, the Berossos traditions maintained that Shamash-shum-ukin (Sammuges or Samoges) had been succeeded on the throne for twenty-one years variously by "his brother" or by "Sardanapallos" (*FGrH* 680 F 7, Schnabel, *Berossos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*, pp. 269-270 nos. 43 and 47; Burstein, *SANE* 1/5 24-25).

526. Note the text *BIN* 2132, which deals with gifts of *širkātu* to Ishtar and Nanaya in Uruk, mentions benefactions by Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon but then—for the period

shadowy figure and because he and Ashurbanipal seem to have died in the same year (627),⁵²⁷ it has sometimes been suggested that "Kandalanu" is simply a throne name for Ashurbanipal.⁵²⁸ This hypothesis, however, has little to recommend it. Other alleged cases of Assyrian kings bearing Babylonian throne names (e.g., Tiglath-pileser III and Shalmaneser V) have been shown to be spurious.⁵²⁹ Furthermore, there seems little reason—if Kandalanu and Ashurbanipal were identical—to preserve two entirely different systems of chronological reckoning for one and the same king (dating at Nippur under the name Ashurbanipal with a reign officially beginning in 668 and elsewhere in Babylonia under the name Kandalanu with a reign starting in 647).

Kandalanu was appointed to the Babylonian throne by Ashurbanipal probably within a year after the suppression of the revolt of Shamash-shum-ukin. It appears, however, that Babylonia was only gradually placed in his charge. Babylon itself was under his control by X-6-647 and Uruk by VII-11-646;⁵³⁰ but at some cities in the heartland of northwest Babylonia, texts were still being dated under Ashurbanipal in Kandalanu's first and second regnal years: at Borsippa as late as IX-18-647 and at Dilhat on I-29-646.⁵³¹ After 646, only Nippur remained under the explicit control of Ashurbanipal; and elsewhere texts were uniformly dated under Kandalanu.⁵³²

The opening years of Kandalanu's reign saw Babylonia only slowly

after 648 B.C.—refers to Kudurru, governor of Uruk and Shamash-^td(ann)inanni(?), governor of Akkad (^tmaUTU-di-na-an-ni LU.¹[GAR]¹KUR URIKI¹ in line 12, cf. line 10 [references collated]; the text does not refer to Kandalanu in so far as can be determined).

527. The much later "Berossos" evidence (see n. 525) is also occasionally adduced, since Ashurbanipal ("Sardanapallos") was Shamash-shum-ukin's brother.

528. Or even that Kandalanu was a statue which represented Ashurbanipal at the New Year's Festival (Reade, *JCS* 23 [1970-71] 1).

529. I.e., for Tiglath-pileser III (Pulu) and Shalmaneser V (Ululayu); see *PKB*, pp. 61-62.

530. *VAS* 5 3; *NBC* 8392 (unpublished tablet with the governor of Uruk as the first witness; the GN before the date is heavily damaged). The reference to a text dated under Kandalanu at Uruk in VI-647 (*RLA* 5 368) is incorrect.

531. *FB* 10 (1968) 57-58 no. 13, Ashmolean 1924.484 (mentioned by Langdon, *JRAS* 1928 321; text personally collated).

532. There are, however, no texts dated at Ur between 647 and 627; so it has yet to be determined whether this city fell under the nominal jurisdiction of Kandalanu. The lack of economic texts dated at Ur under either Kandalanu or Nabopolassar, i.e., from 647 to 605, leads one to wonder whether the fate of the city at the end of the Shamash-shum-ukin revolt may have been unusually severe. Economic texts dated at Ur and excavated there resume in

recovering from the effects of the Great Rebellion. Economic activity for his first five years dropped back to the level of some twenty-five years earlier.⁵³³ As for the rehabilitation of the Babylonian civil administration, Ashurbanipal stated: "I imposed upon them (i.e., the people of Babylonia) the yoke of the god Ashur which they had cast off; I established over them governors (*šaknūti*) and officials (*qīpāni*) whom I had selected"⁵³⁴—with no explicit mention of the installation of Kandalanu. In the south, Kudurru served as governor at Uruk after the revolt;⁵³⁵ and Bel-ihni continued his activity in the Sealand, which included raids against Elam.⁵³⁶ Elam also served as a refuge for fugitive Babylonians and Chaldeans from Uruk, Nippur, Larak, Bit-Dakkuri, and Bit-Amukani who had withheld taxes from Ashurbanipal during the rebellion and later fled into exile; many of these people were eventually captured on the Assyrian campaigns into Elam and then taken off to Assyria.⁵³⁷ Nippur, the most persistently rebellious of the Babylonian cities from 680 to 651, was kept under direct Assyrian supervision, perhaps as a garrison town strategically located in central Babylonia.⁵³⁸

By 642 economic activity had returned to its former pace before the rebellion. It then remained at a high level through the rest of Kandalanu's term in office. More than 200 dated economic texts are known from this reign, representing the heaviest concentration (texts per year) for any Babylonian king since the thirteenth century.⁵³⁹ Almost half of these texts

the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II (604-562); but there are relatively few of them, and the first texts with reasonably clear place names and dates (*UET* 4 7 and 51) are dated in 576 B.C., Nebuchadnezzar's twenty-ninth year (*UET* 4 33, from Nebuchadnezzar's second year, unfortunately has a badly damaged place name—the traces of which are not inconsistent with Ur).

533. I.e., the last few years of Esarhaddon's reign. Cf. *JCS* 35 (1983) 19, 39-40.

534. Streck, *Asb*, p. 40 iv 103-105. One of these officials was presumably Shamash-damhanni, who served as "governor (*šakin māti*) of Akkad," or "provincial official (NAM) of Babylon" (Falkner, *AJO* 17 [1954-56] 106 and 118; cf. probably *BIN* 2 132:10, 12 [see n. 526 above; text collated]; Frame, *diss.*, p. 116 n. 1 and p. 251).

535. Pohl, *AnOr* 9 13 (cf. *JCS* 35 [1983] 25 Jn.8); *YBC* 7166 (unpublished). Cf. *ABL* 274, 277, 518, 754 (+*CT* 54 250), etc.; also *BIN* 2 132:8, 12 (text collated, cf. n. 528 above).

536. E.g., *ABL* 280; cf. *ABL* 462 (Frame, *diss.*, p. 178 n. 1).

537. Knudsen, *Iraq* 29 (1967) 59, text damaged; Frame, *diss.*, pp. 175-176.

538. Frame, *diss.*, p. 169 (who points out that there is no direct proof for the presence of an Assyrian army at Nippur). If Nippur was the home of a garrison, this would represent a departure from previous policy.

539. *JCS* 35 (1983) 39-52.

(48%) come from the principal cities in the northwest: Babylon, Borsippa, Sippar, Dilbat, and Hursagkalama.⁵⁴⁰ In the far south Uruk is well represented in the first six years of the reign (28% of the texts from 647 to 642), but then declines drastically (only 5% of the texts for the rest of the reign).⁵⁴¹ The texts embrace a wide range of activities; but livestock accounts (especially for sheep and goats), purchases of real estate, and promissory notes are most common. Particularly noteworthy are accounts dealing with oil and with iron (especially large quantities of iron, which was sometimes imported from Cilicia) and purchases of prebends (*isqu*).⁵⁴² The only traces of active Assyrian intervention in the land are in Ashurbanipal's building activities at the religious centers of Babylon, Borsippa, Cutha, Nippur, and Sirara (Tell Haddad).⁵⁴³

Events at the close of Kandalanu's reign show Assyria rapidly losing control over Babylonia. In 627, Kandalanu died at some point between III-8 and VIII-1(+).⁵⁴⁴ Ashurbanipal may have died in the same year, according to evidence from the next century.⁵⁴⁵ About the same time as

540. The provenience of these texts is explicitly stated in their date formulae. Additional texts which lack explicit designation of their origin may actually have come from the same area; further prosopographical studies may lead to more precise geographical attribution in many cases.

541. The accidents of discovery may significantly influence these statistics.

542. The translation "prebend" for *isqu* should be regarded as a compromise, pending further investigation.

543. Nassouhi, *AfK* 2 (1924-25) 97-106; Hilprecht, *Excavations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century*, pp. 460-462; Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 146-152, 186, 350-352 (5 NT 703 is a duplicate of no. 3b); McCown and Haines, *OIP* 78 18-20, 27, 29; Gibson, *OIAR* 1981-82, pp. 40-48, Gibson *et al.*, "The Southern Corner of Nippur," *Sumer*, forthcoming; *Iraq* 43 (1981) 177-178; F. Rashid, *Sumer* 37 (1981) 72-80 (Arabic section); Hannoun, *BSMS* 2 (1982) 5-6; Frame, *diss.*, pp. 173-174. It is difficult in some cases to determine whether construction took place before and/or after Shamash-shum-ukin's rebellion. See also n. 427 above.

For further "Neo-Assyrian" evidence from Tell Haddad, see *Iraq* 45 (1983) 210-211.

544. The last known text mentioning Kandalanu as living is BM 50270 dated III-8-627; the first posthumous date in his name is on BM 36514 from Babylon, dated VIII-1(+)-627 (i.e., year 21). The former text is unpublished; the latter has been published by Wiseman, *Chronicles*, pls. 20-21. A list of Babylonian economic texts dated according to Kandalanu in the year 627 may be found in *JCS* 35 (1983) 49.

545. An inscription written in the name of Nabonidus' mother (AnSt 8 [1958] 46) mentions Ashurbanipal's forty-second year, thus implying that he survived until at least 627. The chronology in this text, however, is not without its problems.

Kandalanu's death,⁵⁴⁶ civil disorder broke out in Babylon;⁵⁴⁷ and the Assyrian Sin-shar-ishkun, who was later to govern parts of Babylonia, fled to Assyria.⁵⁴⁸ The Assyrian army subsequently entered the city of Shaznaku and set fire to its temple (VI-12-627); for protection, the gods of Kish were sent to Babylon. In VII-627, an Assyrian army forced Nabopolassar, the new Babylonian leader, to withdraw from Nippur and pursued him as far

546. The dating of events here to the year 627 depends on an interpretation of Babylonian chronicle no. 2 (lines 1-13, text in *TCS* 5 87-88) which is open to question. There are at least three different ways of dating the occurrences described in these lines: to the year 626 alone, to 627-626, or to 628-627. For the standard chronicle series pertaining to the Neo-Babylonian dynasty (*TCS* 5, chronicles 2-7), the passage is anomalous according to any interpretation: (a) if it refers only to 626, it lists at least one month out of order (VI—VII—II—VII); (b) if it refers to more than one year, it omits both the customary horizontal dividing line between years and the introductory chronological phrase indicating the specific year (expected perhaps at the beginning of line 10, but given somewhat awkwardly in lines 14 and 15). I have arbitrarily elected to follow the 627-626 alternative here.

547. It is uncertain whether Kandalanu's death preceded the disturbances, but this seems a reasonable assumption. His death is not mentioned in the preserved portion of Babylonian chronicle no. 2, which begins before VI-12-627 (according to the interpretation followed here); this date could then offer a *terminus ante quem* for his demise (since the death of the monarch would hardly have been omitted from the detailed narrative of this politically oriented chronicle).

548. Present evidence, though not univocal, seems to indicate that there were political disturbances also in Assyria between 631 and 626 B.C. It is worth noting that the Akitu Chronicle, lines 24-26 (*TCS* 5 132), records anarchy (*sahmašātu*) in both Assyria and Babylonia in the year 626; cf. the situation depicted in Crayson, *BHLT*, p. 82. Government instability in each land undoubtedly aggravated the situation.

The vexatious question of the chronological placement of Babylonian economic texts dated under Ashur-etel-ilani, Sin-shumu-lishir, Sin-shar-ishkun, and the *edel bābi* era (listed most recently in *JCS* 35 [1983] 52-60) has been left aside for the present. It seems probable that this group of documents spans a period extending both before and after the accession of Nabopolassar and may eventually help to determine more clearly the course of events and political vicissitudes in Babylonia between 630 and 618 B.C.; but none of the presently proposed chronological solutions (Borger, *WZKM* 55 [1959] 62-76 and *JCS* 19 [1965] 59-78; J. Oates, *Iraq* 27 [1965] 135-159; Reade, *JCS* 23 [1970-71] 1-9; von Soden, *WZKM* 53 [1956-57] 316-321 and *ZA* 58 [1967] 241-255) is without its difficulties. Cf. the comments of Zawadzki, *Folia Orientalia* 20 (1979) 181-183; of Leichty, *JAOS* 103 (1983) 220; and of Tadmor in Tadmor and Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, p. 52. Adding still another interpretation here would compound confusion without materially improving the present historical essay.

Note also the inscription of Ashur-etel-ilani recording a dedication to Marduk, presumably in Babylon, about this time (Leichty, *JAOS* 103 [1983] 217-220). Cf. n. 388 above for the return of the body of the Chaldean leader, Shamash-ibni, to Babylonia about the same time.

as Uruk, but was itself then compelled to retreat. The situation was clearly unstable.

The year 626 saw further upheaval. Even in later historical tradition there was no agreement as to who was even nominally in control of the land. A Seleucid kinglist records that in this year the government of Babylonia was in the hands of two Assyrians, Sin-shumu-lishir and Sin-shar-ishkun;⁵⁴⁹ but a Babylonian chronicle refers to 626 as "the first year in which there was no king in the land."⁵⁵⁰ Early in the year (II-626), an Assyrian army came down to Babylonia and five months later attacked Babylon itself. In contrast to earlier occasions on which Babylon had first been besieged and later overwhelmed by the Assyrians, the men of Babylon sallied forth and plundered the Assyrian army. In the next month (VIII-26-626), Nabopolassar officially mounted the throne in Babylon, inaugurating a new era.⁵⁵¹

549. Van Dijk, *UVB* 18 53. (Borger, *AfO* 25 [1974-77] 165-166, withdraws an earlier suggestion made in *JCS* 19 [1965] 74 concerning the beginning of the kinglist.)

550. Babylonian chronicle no. 2:14 (text in *TCS* 5 88). Note that the phrase cited here is probably part of the date formula (followed by month and day), not an independent sentence, and the translation should be revised accordingly. Cf. Babylonian Chronicle iii 28 (text in *TCS* 5 81). For the sense of *istêt* as "first," see *CAD* I/J 278.

551. The dynasty founded by Nabopolassar is frequently dubbed "Chaldean" by historians, but there is no unambiguous evidence that either Nabopolassar himself or any of his successors was in fact Chaldean. In one of his own inscriptions, Nabopolassar refers to himself as "son of a nobody" (*apil la mammani*, *VAB* 4 66 no. 4:4), but gives no other indication of his origins. Other evidence comes from much later times or from biblical or classical authors, when "Chaldean" often served as a synonym for "Babylonian" and no longer had its former precise ethnic significance. Nabopolassar's association with southeastern Babylonia and the Chaldeans comes principally from later evidence of questionable value: a Seleucid colophon (Thureau-Dangin, *Rituel accadiens*, p. 65:47 = Hunger, *Kolophon*, no. 107, in which he is given the title *šar māt tāmī*, "king of the Sealand") and from historians in the Hellenistic tradition (*FGH* 680 F 7-8 and 685 F 5, according to which he was first an official serving under Sarakos, i.e., Sin-shar-ishkun, and then became king "of Babylon and the Chaldeans"). It should be noted that the earliest occurrence of Nabopolassar in a chronicle (Babylonian chronicle no. 2:7; text in *TCS* 5 88) has him at Nippur, whence he withdrew to Uruk (W. C. Lambert in *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic*, p. 19 n. 17 suggests that Nabopolassar may have come from Uruk; the text in Crayson, *BHLT*, pp. 82-86, apparently dealing with the accession of Nabopolassar, gives no further information in this regard). It is therefore misleading to label either Nabopolassar or his dynasty Chaldean until such time as more solid evidence is forthcoming. Note also the restricted use of "Chaldean" described by Rochberg-Halton, *JNES* 43 (1984) 115.

There is at least one economic text dated under Nabopolassar in his accession year which

It is unfortunate that these decades, 647-627, immediately antedating the rise of the Neo-Babylonian empire in Mesopotamia, are not better attested. It is clear that Babylonia's economy quickly recovered from the effects of the civil war; but Babylonia's king, Kandalanu, is at present known only as a name in dating formulae or in chronological documents. We cannot as yet appraise the factors which shaped the course of Babylonian history during this time. We do not know whether the economic recovery took place under stricter Assyrian occupation or whether stability was achieved because urban Babylonians and Chaldeans temporarily abandoned their unsuccessful struggle for independence and acquiesced in Assyrian rule; and there are obviously other alternatives that might be considered. The silence of the sources allows myriad interpretations.

antedates the official date for his installation in Babylon (VIII-26-626) as given in Babylonian chronicle no. 2:14 (text in *TCS* 5 88): BM 49656, dated VI-22-accession year (published by Wiseman, *Chronicles*, pl. XXI and kindly collated by C. B. F. Walker). PTS 2208, an economic text from year 20 of Nabopolassar (= 606 B.C.), mentions IV-10-accession year of the same king (information courtesy of Grant Frame, Douglas Kennedy, and Erle Leichty). NCBT 557, alleged to be a text from earlier in the accession year (Goetze, *JNES* 3 [1944] 44; Parker and Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology* 626 B.C.-A.D. 75, p. 11), in fact reads: ITI CU, U, 13? (+) KAM/MU.SAC N[AM.LUC]AL[(x)]/AC-IBIL[A-x] (personal collation); the RN could be restored either as *Nabû-apl[a-iddin]* or *Nabû-apl[a-ušur]*, and it is inadvisable to assign this to Nabopolassar until further study has been undertaken.

Note on Sources

For the history of Bahylonia between 747 and 626 B.C., there is a broad range of epigraphic and archeological evidence and, in some areas of the documentary record, significant amounts of extant material. But, as is frequently the case in Mesopotamian studies, much of this evidence remains unpublished; and there has been little critical appraisal of either published or unpublished sources. Thus the historian is faced with substantial data, almost all in very raw form; a considerable amount of basic research has yet to be done before the full potential of this material can begin to be realized.

The following pages present a brief survey of the major types of sources, written and non-written, pertaining to this period. No attempt has been made at bibliographical completeness.

We shall begin with the most illuminating and also the most voluminous of the written materials, the correspondence of the Assyrian court.⁵⁵² In the imperial archives at Calah and Nineveh, more than 3200 documents have been found which date between 735 and 645 B.C.⁵⁵³ A substantial portion of this material deals with affairs in Bahylonia: reports from local officials on events of political or diplomatic significance, requests for economic or military aid, and comments on the unpopularity of the Assyrian regime, to name a few topics. The letters are not spread evenly over this period, but are concentrated principally in three phases (in 720-717 and 713-705 under Sargon II and in 673-664 under Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal) with

552. A useful survey by Parpola of the Assyrian letters may be found in *ARINH*, pp. 117-142. Principal publications of the Nineveh archives are: R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Kouyunjik Collection(s) of the British Museum* (= *ABL*); L. Waterman, *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire* (transcription and transliteration of Harper, *ABL*); R. H. Pfeiffer, *State Letters of Assyria* (transcription and translation of some letters in Harper, *ABL*); S. Parpola, *CT 53*; M. Dietrich, *CT 54*. Note also the editions of Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal* (parts 1, 2A, 2). Some of the Calah letters have been published by H. W. F. Saggs in *Iraq* 17 (1955) through 36 (1974), *passim*.

553. In addition, Parpola has dated *ABL* 1444 (= *LAS* 1 no. 105) to 621 B.C. in the time of Sin-shar-ishkun (*LAS* 2 90).

sparser coverage of certain years under Tiglath-pileser III (735-727) and Ashurhanipal (655-645).⁵⁵⁴ Of particular significance is the dearth of letters under Sennacherib (705-681) and late in the reign of Ashurhanipal (645-627), since this skews the source materials available for these decades. The extensive court correspondence furnishes insights into the inner workings of the administrative system of the Assyrian empire and—apart from occasional self-serving statements by officials—gives a private, non-propagandistic view of Assyrian successes and failures. These letters contain a wealth of incidental detail on life in Babylonia: tribal disputes, irrigation problems, regional rivalries, the rhythm of the economy. But serious difficulties in using these documents cannot be overlooked:

- (1) many of the letters are broken or otherwise damaged;
- (2) their language tends to be colloquial, highly idiomatic, and therefore not always readily comprehensible;
- (3) the date of each document must usually be inferred;⁵⁵⁵
- (4) the historical context of the message is often unclear, since a writer seldom rehearses well-known background for his correspondent.

There are few letters from this period which were found in Babylonia itself, and only two of these have been plausibly dated to the early seventh century.⁵⁵⁶ Also to be placed here is the so-called Assur Ostrakon, a letter written in Aramaic and found at Assur, which was sent as a report from southern Babylonia about the middle of the seventh century.⁵⁵⁷

Another significant corpus of material is the scattered group of more than six hundred indigenous economic texts (legal and administrative) dating from between 747 and 626. More than sixty percent of these

554. The years from 664 to 655 are only slightly represented. See the chart by Parpola, *ARINH*, p. 136 for the Assyrian material, cf. *LAS* 2 411-427. The distribution of the Neo-Babylonian letters from these archives conforms to the same general pattern.

555. Less than ten of the documents bear an explicit date. Parpola, *LAS* 2, has recently attempted to give specific dates to many of the letters which describe astronomical phenomena.

556. (1) *UET* 4 167 (edited by Ebeling, *Neubabylonische Briefe*, no. 303), a Neo-Babylonian letter excavated at Ur; (2) *PBS* 7 132 (edited by Parpola, *LAS* 1 no. 226 and commented on in *LAS* 2 218), a Neo-Assyrian letter bought from a dealer perhaps as part of a collection of tablets from Sippar. An unpublished group of more than one hundred letters and fragments found at Nippur in 1973 (mentioned by Civil, *OIC* 23 113-114) may also date from the second half of the eighth century.

557. Gibson, *TSSI* 2 20; Donner and Röllig, *KAI* no. 233.

documents come from the major urban centers of Sippar, Babylon, Borsippa, Dilhat, Nippur, and Uruk, which have been subjected to controlled and uncontrolled excavations.⁵⁵⁸ Most of the texts are legal documents; and they are concerned principally with financial transactions or with income-producing property: purchases of land (agricultural and urban), loans, and acquisition of prebends (*isqu*). There are various types of account texts, many of them dealing with herds of sheep or cattle, allocation of foodstuffs, or disbursement of metal (silver, gold, and iron). Of particular interest for future study will be two common features of legal texts: the witness lists with their individual genealogies and the detailed descriptions of real estate (house plots, fields, and date-palm groves). As yet, only about one-third of these texts have been published in any form; and no systematic attempt has been made to utilize them for historical purposes. These documents should prove a mine of information for researchers interested in demography, social institutions, economic history, and even ancient technology.⁵⁵⁹

Also of considerable interest is the extensive corpus of Assyrian royal inscriptions, which contain detailed accounts of the Babylonian campaigns of Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon II, Sennacherib, and Ashurbanipal.⁵⁶⁰ The

558. I.e., they are explicitly designated as coming from these sites in their place-date formulae. Both Ur and Kish-Hursagkalama have also yielded economic texts from this time, but not in significant numbers. Less than 20% of the corpus was found in controlled excavations in Babylonia, chiefly at Nippur, Uruk, Babylon, and Ur.

559. A comprehensive bibliography of these economic texts has been published by Brinkman and Kennedy in *JCS* 35 (1983) 1-90.

560. Esarhaddon's armies also campaigned in Babylonia, but his scribes recorded only a few of these contacts and in summary fashion. A somewhat outdated English translation of many important Assyrian royal inscriptions may be found in D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. Principal editions:

- (1) Tiglath-pileser III: P. Rost, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileasers III*; new edition in preparation by H. Tadmor;
- (2) Sargon II.
 - (a) A. G. Lie, *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria*, part 1: *The Annals*;
 - (b) H. Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons*;
 - (c) D. G. Lyon, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons Königs von Assyrien*;
- (3) Sennacherib: D. D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib*;
- (4) Esarhaddon: R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Assarhaddons Königs von Assyrien*;
- (5) Ashurbanipal:
 - (a) M. Streck, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergang Ninivehs*;

Assyrian scribes recorded much information that is invaluable to the modern historian—details about the topography, flora, fauna, and social and economic institutions of the inhabitants. If one prescind from the tendentious style glorifying the Assyrian monarchy and military, one can quickly strike a core of usable data. For example, statistics given by these texts for people deported to various sections of the empire are among the few numbers available for Babylonian and tribal populations, even though they are difficult to use critically. (The figures seem uniformly too high, probably because greater magnitude was perceived as ideologically desirable.)

Babylonian royal inscriptions are a much smaller and duller lot. There are a few short texts written in the name of Merodach-baladan II and Shamash-shum-ukin; but, except for a veiled reference to an Assyrian military reversal in 720 B.C., most of the texts are either conventional expressions of pious sentiments or laconic records of repair to religious structures.⁵⁶¹

Inscriptions written by or for local officials or dignitaries present a more interesting and variegated picture. From the reign of Nahonassar there is a text written in the name of two private individuals who describe how they repaired the *akitu* temple at Uruk because this duty had not been performed by those responsible (i.e., the king and local officials).⁵⁶² Three decades later, a governor of Kish recorded his construction of a bridge over a principle local waterway (the Banitu canal).⁵⁶³ Toward the close of

(b) A. C. Piepkorn, *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal*, vol. 1: Editions E, B₁₋₅, D, and K,

(c) T. Bauer, *Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals*,

(d) J.-M. Aynard, *Le prisme du Louvre AO 19.939* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, vol. 309).

In general, when editions published before 1915 have been cited in this monograph, cross-references have also been given to the pertinent sections in Luckenbill's *ARAB*.

561. Bibliography (Merodach-baladan II): Cadd, *Iraq* 15 (1953) 123-134; UVB 1 54-55 nos. 16-18; King, *BBS* no. 35 (see Seux, *RA* 54 [1960] 206-208); VAS 1 37. Bibliography (Shamash-shum-ukin): Lehmann, *Šamaššumukīn* 26-12 (Pinckert, *Hymnen und Gebete an Nebo*, no. 6); Scheil, *RT* 16 (1894) 91-92 (= Walker, *CBI* no. 77); cf. W. C. Lambert, *AfO* 18 (1957-58) 385-387. Some of the inscriptions of Sargon, Esarhaddon, and Ashurbanipal were written primarily for use in Babylonia (e.g., UVB 1 55-60 nos. 19-25; Borger, *Asarh.*, pp. 70-71 [Nippur], 73-78 [Uruk]; Goetze, *JCS* 17 [1963] 119-131; Biggs, *AS* 17 no. 30; Civil, *RA* 68 [1974] 94; Streck, *Asb.*, pp. 226-248, 276-286, 350-352; Walker, *CBI* nos. 76 and 78), but are for the most part confined to conventional religious epithets and building activities.

562. *WO* 5/1 (1969) 39-50, with duplicates noted there.

563. Latest edition: Walker, *CBI* no. 75.

the eighth century, a local temple official restored plundered statues of the gods to the town Sha-usur-Adad and secured tax exemptions from Bel-ihni, the reigning monarch⁵⁶⁴. From Ur about 665-650 B.C. date several monumental building inscriptions in the name of the local governor Sin-balassu-iqbi⁵⁶⁵ as well as a votive text of his brother and successor, Sin-sharra-usur.⁵⁶⁶

Contemporary texts of at least incidental value include formal omen inquiries from the Assyrian court, soliciting information from the gods on how current crises were to be resolved.⁵⁶⁷ Also of interest are scholarly texts, including lexical series (*Erimhuš*),⁵⁶⁸ a compendium listing flora associated with Merodach-baladan's garden (*gannatu*),⁵⁶⁹ and prayers and rituals written down in the time of Shamash-shum-ukin;⁵⁷⁰ these represent various scribal traditions that flourished in this period. In addition there are a number of passing references to Babylonia and its inhabitants in contemporary economic texts in Assyria; these have yet to be systematically collected and evaluated.

Providing an essential chronological framework for the overall historical picture are the kinglists and chronicles, which are concerned primarily with chronology and with military and religious event-history. The kinglists, Babylonian and Assyrian, give the names and sequence of monarchs who ruled during this period and sometimes their lengths of reign.⁵⁷¹ The heterogeneous Babylonian chronicles furnish an indispensable chronological listing of the beginnings and ends of reigns for kings in Babylonia, Elam, and Assyria, especially for the years from 745 to 668; they also mention and often date major events of political or religious

564. Walker, *Iraq* 44 (1982) 70-76 no. 1; additional comments in *JCS* 35 (1983) 15 En.1.

565. *UET* 1 168-183; *UET* 8 102 (transliteration and translation in *Or* 38 [1969] 339-342).

566. *TCL* 12 13 (duplicate: *DCEHE* 1 pl. 86 no. 144). Durand, *RA* 75 (1981) 181-185, corrects earlier misreadings by Nougayrol (*RA* 36 [1939] 32) and Scheil (*RT* 36 [1914] 188-190). See also *JCS* 35 (1983) 39 Kn.11.

567. Klauber, *PRT*.

568. *VAT* 13100; cf. n. 440 above.

569. *CT* 14 50; cf. *Studies Oppenheim*, p. 48 under 44.3.5.

570. Sources are listed in n. 439 above.

571. The texts have been conveniently collected by Crayson, *RLA* 6 86-135 nos. 3.3, 3.5, 3.12, 3.17.

significance.⁵⁷² The Assyrian eponym chronicles record the destination of the principal annual campaigns of the Assyrian army between 747 and 699 (with lacunae) and give supplementary details for the years 745, 729-728, 710-709, 707, 704, and 700.⁵⁷³ Additional chronological information is provided by other texts: an astronomical diary⁵⁷⁴ and nineteen-year cycle texts,⁵⁷⁵ astronomical records including planetary observations from the reign of Kandalanu⁵⁷⁶ and later references in Ptolemy's *Almagest*,⁵⁷⁷ and the so-called "Ptolemaic Canon" (which includes a list of Babylonian monarchs and the lengths of their reigns, beginning with Nabonassar).⁵⁷⁸

Later texts of interest include sections from the writings of the Hellenistic historian Berossos,⁵⁷⁹ from biblical books,⁵⁸⁰ and from Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*.⁵⁸¹ These late traditions are frequently garbled and sometimes difficult to interpret chronologically. They add incidental details to the historical picture, but must be used with considerable caution.⁵⁸²

572. The principal chronicles and their pertinent chronological coverage are the Babylonian Chronicle (c. 745-668), Babylonian chronicle no. 2 (c. 627-626), the Esarhaddon Chronicle (680-c. 667, with flashback), the Shamash-shum-ukin Chronicle (694-650), and the Akitu Chronicle (688-626). The texts are collected in Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (TGS 5).

573. Ungnad, RLA 2 428-435.

574. BM 32312, published in photo by Sachs in F. R. Hodson, ed., *The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World*, pl. 3.

575. E.g., BM 33809, mentioned by Frame, *diss.*, pp. 19-20.

576. Walker, BSMS 5 (1983) 20-21.

577. LBA^T 1414-1418 (and possibly 1413); cf. n. 441 above. For translations of the *Almagest*, see: K. Manitius, *Ptolemäus, Handbuch der Astronomie*; G. J. Toomer, *Ptolemy's Almagest*.

578. C. Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, pp. 304-306.

579. FGrH 680 (see also P. Schnabel, *Berossos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*; S. Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berossus* [SANE 1/5]). Note also the relevant fragments in the Abydenos collection (FGrH 685).

580. 2 Kings 17:24 and 20:12-21; 2 Chronicles 32:31 (cf. 33:11, which describes Manasseh being brought as captive to Babylon—an incident of unknown date); Isaiah 39:1-8; Ezra 4:9-10.

581. IX.xiv.3, X.ii.2.

582. Also relevant to this period may be the prophecy text published by Hunger, *SpTU* 13 (see also Hunger and Kaufman, *JAOS* 95 [1975] 371-375; Höffken, *WO* 9 [1977-78] 57-71). W. G. Lambert has made a plausible case for identifying some of the unnamed kings in this

Turning now to the extensive anepigraphic materials, we note first the regional evidence reconstructed from surface surveys: location of watercourses and settlements, urban and village hierarchies, and synchronic and diachronic patterns of expansion and abandonment.⁵⁸³ For the lower Diyala basin and the ribbon of settlement extending along the older course of the Euphrates from just above Nippur down to Ur, we now have preliminary statistics for a local history of urbanism.⁵⁸⁴ Excavations at Babylon, Kish-Hursagkalama, Nippur, Uruk, and Ur, as well as in the Hamrin, have revealed monumental buildings and residences in use in this period; but, except at Ur in the massive reconstruction undertaken by Sin-balassu-iqbi,⁵⁸⁵ there are few of these buildings which can be seen to have originated—rather than simply to have been repaired—at this time.⁵⁸⁶ In

vaticinium ex eventu as Merodach-baladan II, Sargon II, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal, and Nabopolassar (*The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic*, pp. 10-12; cf. *JAOS* 103 [1983] 215).

An Aramaic text in demotic script, Papyrus Amherst no. 63 in the Morgan Library, which is being published by Charles Nims and Richard Steiner in a series of joint articles, contains a lengthy section dealing with Shamash-shum-ukin. On this text, see the preliminary remarks by Bowman, *JNES* 3 (1944) 219-231; Nims, *OJAR* (1980-81) 47-48; Nims and Steiner, *JAOS* 103 (1983) 261-274 and *JNES* 43 (1984) 89-114; Vleeming and Wesselijs, *BiOr* 39 (1982, appeared 1983) 501-509. The Shamash-shum-ukin episode itself is treated in an article by Nims and Steiner (*Revue biblique*, in press).

583. R. Adams, *Land behind Baghdad*; R. Adams and H. Nissen, *The Uruk Countryside*; R. Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, with an appendix by H. Wright. H. Gasche and L. De Meyer in L. De Meyer, ed., *Tell ed-Dēr* 31-13 and plan 1. McG. Gibson, *The City and Area of Kish*, with an appendix by R. Adams. Note also G. Roux, "Recently Discovered Ancient Sites in the Hammar Lake District (Southern Iraq)," *Sumer* 16 (1960) 20-31, and T. Jacobsen, *Salinity and Irrigation Agriculture in Antiquity*.

584. See *JNES* 43 (1984) 169-180. Further statistics may be forthcoming for the Isin, Tell ed-Dēr, Hamrin, and Haditha regions.

585. Summarized in *Or* 34 (1965) 249-251 and *Or* 38 (1969) 336-342.

586. Select bibliography of principal excavations:

- (1) Babylon: R. Koldewey, *WVDOG* 2 and 15; R. Koldewey, *Das wieder erstehende Babylon*, 4th ed.; O. Reuther, *WVDOG* 47; F. Wetzel, *WVDOG* 48; F. Wetzel and F. Weissbach, *WVDOG* 59; E. Unger, *Babylon, die heilige Stadt*;
- (2) Kish: L. G. Watelin, *Excavations at Kish*, vol. 3; McG. Gibson, *The City and Area of Kish*; P. R. S. Moorey, *Kish Excavations*;
- (3) Nippur: D. McGown and R. Haines, *OIP* 78; D. McGown, R. Haines, and R. Biggs, *OIP* 97; McG. Gibson *et al.*, *OIG* 23; McG. Gibson, *OJAR* 1981-82, pp. 40-48; V. Grawford, *Archaeology* 12 (1959) 74-83; D. Hansen and G. Dales, *Archaeology* 15 (1962) 75-84; McG. Gibson *et al.*, "The Southern Corner of Nippur," *Sumer*, forthcoming; *Iraq* 45 (1983) 217;

most instances, we know more about major building projects from inscriptions than we do from excavations.⁵⁸⁷

Apart from architecture, the material culture of this age, which may be reconstructed from archeological as well as documentary evidence, has not been extensively studied and offers a promising field for future research. A satisfactory typology for the pottery of eighth- and seventh-century Babylonia has yet to be worked out, although there seem to be distinctive ceramics from this time, including vessels in use at Nippur which have decoration akin to Assyrian palace ware.⁵⁸⁸ Better dated are the kudurrus, stone stelae which in some cases bear the names of contemporary rulers;⁵⁸⁹ these often have representations of divine symbols and in two instances portray the contemporary Babylonian monarch.⁵⁹⁰ Also noteworthy are terracotta busts, plaques, and molds depicting divine, royal, and common human figures;⁵⁹¹ recent finds at Nippur include a plaque showing the goddess Ishtar—clasping a bow and arrows—stepping on the back of a lion as well as a mold for making figurines of a king.⁵⁹² Bronze statuettes include representations of a man with a dog (presumably a devotee of the goddess Gula), which have been found at Isin and in the

(4) Ur: L. Woolley, *UE 8 and UE 9*; L. Woolley, *Ur 'of the Chaldees'* (revised by P. R. S. Moorey); J. Brinkman, *Or* 34 (1965) 241-258 and *Or* 38 (1969) 310-348;

(5) Uruk: J. Jordan *et al.*, *UVB series (passim)*; summary of first eleven seasons by R. North, *Or* 26 (1957) 185-256.

See also the reports on smaller sites such as F. Safar, *Sumer* 5 (1949) 154-172.

587. Particularly in the case of Esarhaddon's rebuilding of Babylon, well attested in the texts but almost impossible to reconstruct from presently known archeological traces. Most Esarhaddon bricks at Babylon were not found *in situ*.

588. McGuire Gibson, personal communication. James A. Armstrong, a student in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, University of Chicago, is engaged on doctoral research which will include a ceramic typology for this period, based principally on recent excavations at Nippur. For first-millennium pottery from Isin, see Hrouda, *Isin-Isān Bahriyat* 1 55-63.

589. Seidl, *Bagh. Mitt.* 4 (1968) 59-63, nos. 101-102 and 104-110.

590. Parrot, *The Arts of Assyria*, p. 169 fig. 216; Moorey, *Ancient Iraq*, p. 34, pl. XXIV.

591. P. O. Harper, *Iranica Antiqua* 17 (1982) 65-84; McGuire Gibson *et al.*, "The Southern Corner of Nippur," *Sumer*, forthcoming.

592. Gibson, *OIAR* 1981-82, pp. 45-46.

Heraion on Samos,⁵⁹³ and a stag found at Kish.⁵⁹⁴ One may note also Porada's pioneering typology of early Neo-Babylonian glyptic,⁵⁹⁵ although in this regard studies of seals and seal impressions from stratified excavations will remain a prime desideratum.⁵⁹⁶ It will be of particular importance to determine possible cultural influences between contemporary Babylonian and Assyrian art styles,⁵⁹⁷ as well as between Babylonian and Elamite art.⁵⁹⁸

Another archeological area of high potential interest is the use of wall reliefs from Assyrian palaces as illustrated sources for Babylonian history. The systematic interpretation of Assyrian reliefs as historical evidence is still in its infancy. The most recent detailed study of the portrayal of non-Assyrians in the reliefs unfortunately excluded Babylonians (including local Arameans and Chaldeans) and Elamites from consideration.⁵⁹⁹ It is to be regretted that primary publications of Assyrian reliefs have on occasion been insufficiently critical in identifying specific historical persons and places in particular scenes.⁶⁰⁰ This area of research is still underdeveloped, but with improving methodology one may anticipate significant advances in historical and ideological interpretation.⁶⁰¹

593. Hrouda, *Isin-Isān Bahriyat* 1 52-55; Ulf Jantzen, *Ägyptische und orientalische Bronzen aus dem Heraion von Samos*, pp. 70-71 and pl. 72 (BB 779, B 1124, B 1282; see Calmeyer, *ZA* 63 [1973] 128-129); note the additional material in H. Kyrieleis, "Babylonischen Bronzen im Heraion von Samos," *JdI* 94 (1979) 32-48.

594. Moorey, *Ancient Iraq*, p. 36 pl. XXV.

595. *Or* 16 (1947) 145-165.

596. Note the seals from Kish published by Buchanan, *Catalogue of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum* I nos. 661-662 and the seal from Nippur illustrated in *OIAR* 1981-82, p. 47. Seals are only very rarely used on contemporary Babylonian legal documents; a modelled imitation of a seal impression (royal seal?) is on the mid-seventh-century tablet BM 77611+77612+ (a photo of part of the impression may be seen in *ARINH*, pl. VII no. 17).

597. Note the remarks by Gibson, *OIAR* 1981-82, pp. 46-47.

598. Note the preliminary comments by P. de Miroschedji in *RA* 76 (1982) 51-63.

599. M. Wäfler, *Nicht-Assyrischer neuassyrischer Darstellungen*.

600. Identification tends to be tricky in the absence of explicit labelling by epigraph.

601. Select bibliography of Neo-Assyrian relief materials: R. D. Barnett, *Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh*; R. D. Barnett and M. Falkner, *The Sculptures of Ashur-nasir-apli II (883-859 B.C.), Tiglath-pileser III (745-727 B.C.), Esarhaddon (681-669 B.C.) from the Central and South-West Palaces at Nimrud*; R. D. Barnett and A. Lorenzini, *Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum*; P. É. Botta, *Monument de Ninive*; C. J. Cadd, *The*

This brief survey has outlined the principal indigenous and external sources, epigraphic and archeological, that are presently available for the history of Babylonia from 747 to 626 B.C. It is important that we be aware of inevitable distortions in the material. First, the bulk of the textual sources (correspondence and royal inscriptions) originates in the Assyrian or Assyrian-dominated bureaucracy. The letters reflect the interests of that bureaucracy and tend to be obscure to the modern reader (because of background obvious to the correspondents and thus unexpressed); the royal texts are intended primarily to glorify the achievements of the ruler, and literal truth is on occasion sacrificed to ideological preferences. Second, the native Babylonian source material is comprised principally of legal and administrative documents, concerned chiefly with property rights of the urban population and with temple offices, especially in the northwest alluvium; non-economic and rural affairs are seriously under-represented. In the archeological surveys, the bias is reversed; and well-known areas tend to be rural and along the old bed of the Euphrates and in the lower Diyala. The extent of urban centers such as Nippur and Uruk in this period is very poorly known, and the main band of settlements and larger cities along the contemporary course of the Euphrates has barely been touched. Excavations, however, have concentrated on cities and their public edifices; little is known of smaller sites or even of residential quarters within the larger centers. The presently available source material is rich, and much work remains to be done on relatively untapped data. But it is also desirable that future fieldwork be directed to redressing current biases in the distribution of sources: to seek out more Babylonian native materials—textual as well as archeological—in rural areas and in urban residential quarters; and to extend survey coverage to deal effectively with larger towns and cities and with settlements along the contemporary Euphrates⁶⁰² and in northeastern and southeastern Babylonia.

Stones of Assyria, H. R. Hall, *Babylonian and Assyrian Sculpture in the British Museum*; A. H. Layard, *The Monuments of Nineveh* and *A Second Series of the Monuments of Nineveh*, G. Loud and C. Altman, *Khorsabad*, vol. 2; A. Paterson, *Assyrian Sculptures: Palace of Sennacherib*; *Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum from Shalmaneser III to Sennacherib*. See also the bibliography in T. Madhloom, *The Chronology of Neo-Assyrian Art*, pp. 123-130 and the studies by J. Reade in *Bagh. Mitt.* 10-11 (1979-80).

602. Robert Adams informs me that surveying the region of the later Euphrates bed will be difficult if not impossible because of overlying modern cultivation.

Conclusion

We have now surveyed Babylonian history over the turbulent decades between 747 and 626 B.C., from the beginning of the reign of Nabonassar down to the accession of Nabopolassar. These years saw the transformation and revitalization of Babylonia on many levels—demographic, political, socio-economic, and cultural—despite almost constant pressure from the Late Assyrian empire. Although critical appraisal of the voluminous source materials is still at a rudimentary stage, it may be useful to offer here a provisional synthesis of presently observable trends, if for no other reason than to help formulate questions which should be asked as research goes forward.

Babylonia in the mid-eighth century was underpopulated, impoverished and politically fragmented. Disruption caused by its uncontrolled tribal populations soon attracted Assyrian military intervention; but occasional Assyrian repression of the tribes did not suffice to stabilize the land, and Assyria was eventually drawn into direct administration of the Babylonian government. This brought Assyria into nearly continual conflict with the Chaldeans, who over a period of four decades (732-689) alternated with Assyria in control of the Babylonian monarchy. Against the perduring threat of Assyrian domination, the Chaldeans forged far-reaching internal and external alliances, uniting previously discordant tribesmen (Arameans as well as Chaldeans) and the non-tribal populations of Babylonia into a common anti-Assyrian movement and joining to them their eastern and western neighbors, the Elamites and Arabs. This transformation of anti-Assyrian elements within Babylonia into a political coalition was to have consequences lasting beyond these decades and would eventually provide an effective power base for the development of the Neo-Babylonian state after 626 B.C.

The political dimension, however, was only one aspect of Babylonia's growth during these decades. Paradoxically, despite frequent disruptions by war and damage wrought on cities and countryside, there are hints that Babylonia generally prospered, both economically and culturally. With the stabilizing of the monarchy after 689 under Assyrian aegis, the rise in the volume of financial transactions and the monumental urban architectural projects betoken a strengthening of the Babylonian economy. In spite of occasional military interruptions, Babylonian agriculture, live stock-raising, and international trade seem to have thrived; and it is likely that alliances with Elamites and Arabs brought commercial advantages as

well. As population increased, urbanites whose social organization had centered on the family gradually began to align themselves into broader kin-based groups that achieved more effective economic and political representation. Urban centers, though vulnerable to Assyrian devastation and deportation, nonetheless boasted cosmopolitan populations with upper strata of considerable wealth and prestige; even after depopulation, the number of residents seems to have been quickly replenished, perhaps by implosion from the hinterlands. The cultural florescence of the land in science and literature continued a long scholarly tradition that was not impaired by the rise of Aramaic as the vernacular. Babylonia in 626 B.C. on the eve of the Neo-Babylonian empire had not only achieved political unity, but had reached a stage of socio-economic and cultural development that was ready to take full advantage of territorial expansion and augmented international horizons.

Nonetheless there are other significant factors in the history of these decades that we are as yet unable to assess, given the present state of research. In a land where the ecological balance was fragile, the vagaries of climate and demography—still so seldom examined—would have had a profound impact. The shifting status of basic topography—wandering rivers, seasonal marshes, and migratory dunes—must have significantly affected the population. We also know little about the essential features of the rural landscape: its inhabitants, their society and mode of life, their relation to the land, and the precariousness of urban authority in the countryside. We are ill informed about even the more prominent tribes among the Chaldeans and Arameans, their social (or sociopolitical) structure, their economy, their internal development and change under the pressure of Assyrian political power, much less their culture or their interrelations with the older Babylonian population.⁶⁰³ Much remains to be investigated about the urban population: their cultural and economic status, their living conditions, their lack of involvement in politics, their gradual reorientation from small family units to larger kin-based groups that would gain them more effective recognition in a world dominated by tribes and Assyrians. We must also take into consideration local history and

603. One might usefully investigate the fate of the Chaldeans in Babylonian society and politics after 648, since Chaldean tribes and Chaldeans are seldom mentioned in Babylonian texts after that date (except in ethnically non-specific use by biblical and Greek authors; cf. n. 551 above). Should one attribute the relative silence of the sources to decimation of the tribes by Assyrian wars and deportations, to assimilation over time into the general Babylonian population, to loss of political power, or simply to the accidents of textual recovery?

urban particularism, exemplified in such features as the Babylon-Uruk rivalry. In addition, Babylonia itself should be scrutinized as a national state; certainly it was not a "well-defined territorial polity" and it seems to have lacked internal cohesion for much of the period under consideration. Can one at least begin to envisage holistic historical treatment for Babylonia and for the Assyrian empire, which will integrate intellectual and cultural history into the political, social, and economic dimensions of the available presentations? Much work remains to be done on many levels and on topics other than those mentioned here.

Finally, the role of Assyria as catalyst in the eighth- and seventh-century Babylonian transformation should not be underestimated. Anti-Assyrianism provided a rallying cry for the heterogeneous Babylonian populations and stimulated political unity. Assyrian governance in Babylonia eventually strengthened the local monarchy and, especially after 689, created a climate for economic prosperity. But in its Babylonian involvement, the Assyrian empire revealed its own weaknesses and especially the ineffectiveness of its methods for controlling territories that it had won by aggression. The political drama in seventh-century Babylonia highlighted Assyrian inability to effect long-term consolidation of political gains and demonstrated why massive military expenditure would not suffice to keep the empire intact. Despite geographical proximity and strong cultural ties, Assyria with all its armed might could not achieve lasting political control over Babylonia. In effect, the history of these decades could be said to illustrate the rise of Babylonia to the threshold of her greatest political achievements and the paradoxical role of Assyria in facilitating that rise.

Chronological Chart: Rulers of Babylonia, Elam and Assyria 747-626 B.C.

[illegible]

Explanation:

- Explanation:
1. The dates for Babylonian and Assyrian rulers appear in two sub-columns: the first lists the accession year, the second the official years of reign (if extending beyond the accession year). In the first sub-column, in the case of reigns lasting at least one full year, attested dates have been placed in parentheses and not yet attested dates in square brackets. The dates listed for Elamite rulers include the equivalent of the accession year.
 2. Babylonian kings whose names are prefixed by an asterisk reigned simultaneously in Assyria.
 3. Dates in italics are approximate.
 4. The Elamite Tammarritu who ruled c. 652-649 is sometimes termed "Tammarritu II" to distinguish him from the Tammarritu whom the Assyrians installed at Haidalu in 653.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, R. McC. *Heartland of Cities: Surveys of Ancient Settlement and Land Use on the Central Floodplain of the Euphrates*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Adams, R. McC. *Land behind Baghdad: A History of Settlement on the Diyala Plains*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Adams, R. McC. "Settlement and Irrigation Patterns in Ancient Akkad." In McC. Gibson, *The City and Area of Kish*, pp. 182-208. Coconut Grove, Florida: Field Publications, 1972.
- Adams, R. McC. and Nissen, H. *The Uruk Countryside: The Natural Setting of Urban Societies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Ahmed, S. "Ashurbanipal and Shamash-shum-ukin during Esarhaddon's Reign." *Abr-Nahrain* 6 (1965-66) 53-62.
- Ahmed, S. "Causes of Shamash-shum-ukin's Uprising, 652-651 B.C." *ZAW* 79 (1967) 1-13.
- Ahmed, S. *Southern Mesopotamia in the Time of Ashurbanipal*. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.
- Anspacher, A. S. *Tiglath Pileser III*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1912.
- Aro, J. "Remarks on the Practice of Extispicy in the Time of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal." In *La divination en Mésopotamie ancienne et dans les régions voisines*, pp. 109-117. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.
- Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum from Shalmaneser III to Sennacherib*. London: British Museum, 1938.
- Aynard, J.-M. *Le Prisme du Louvre AO 19.939*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1957.
- Barnett, R. D. *Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)*. London: British Museum, 1976.
- Barnett, R. D. and Falkner, M. *The Sculptures of Aššur-našir-apli II (883-859 B.C.), Tiglath-pileser III (745-727 B.C.), Esarhaddon (681-669 B.C.) from the Central and South-West Palaces at Nimrud*. London: British Museum, 1962.
- Barnett, R. D. and Lorenzini, A. *Assyrian Sculpture in the British Museum*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975.
- Barrelet, M.-T. *Figurines et reliefs en terre cuite de la Mésopotamie antique*, vol. 1: *Potiers, termes de métier, procédés de fabrication et production*. Paris: Geuthner, 1968.

- Bauer, T. *Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals*. 2 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1933.
- Bayliss, M. "The Cult of Dead Kin in Assyria and Babylonia." *Iraq* 35 (1973) 115-125.
- Becking, B. "The Two Neo-Assyrian Documents from Gezer in Their Historical Context." *JEOL* 27 (1981-82) 76-89.
- Bezold, C. "Inschriften Sanherib's." In E. Schrader, ed., *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, vol. 2, pp. 80-119. Berlin: H. Reuther, 1890.
- Biggs, R. D. "A Chaldaean Inscription from Nippur." *BASOR* 179 (1965) 36-38.
- Böhl, F. M. Th. *Assyrische en nieuw-babylonische oorkonden (1100-91 v. Chr.). (Mededeelingen uit de Leidsche Verzameling van Spijkerschrift-Inscripties 3.)* Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1936.
- Böhl, F. M. Th. "Eine Tauschurkunde aus dem fünften Regierungsjahr des Aššur-nādin-šumi (694 v. Chr.)." In *Orientalia neerlandica*, pp. 116-137. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1948.
- Borger, R. "Der Aufstieg des neubabylonischen Reiches." *JCS* 19 (1965) 59-78.
- Borger, R. *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien. (AfO Beiheft 9.)* Graz: E. F. Weidner, 1956.
- Borger, R. "Mesopotamien in den Jahren 629-621 v. Chr." *WZKM* 55 (1959) 62-76.
- Borger, R. "Zur Datierung des assyrischen Königs Sinšumulišir." *Or* 36 (1969) 237-239.
- Borger, R. "Zur Königsliste aus Uruk." *AfO* 25 (1974-77) 165-166.
- Borger, R. Review of Benno Landsberger, *Brief eines Bischofs von Esagila an König Asarhaddon*. *BiOr* 29 (1972) 33-37.
- Boserup, E. *Population and Technological Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Botta, P. É. *Monument de Ninive, découvert et décrit par M. P. É. Botta; mesuré et dessiné par M. E. Flandin*. 5 vols. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1849-50.
- Bottéro, J. "Le substitut royal et son sort en Mésopotamie ancienne." *Akkadica* 9 (1978) 2-24.
- Brice, W. C., ed. *The Environmental History of the Near and Middle East since the Last Ice Age*. London, New York, and San Francisco: Academic Press, 1978.
- Brinkman, J. A. "The Akītu Inscription of Bēl-ibni and Nabū-zēra-ušabši." *WO* 5/1 (1969) 39-50.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Babylonia c. 1000-748 B.C." In J. Boardman et al., eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 3 part 1, pp. 282-313. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Babylonia under the Assyrian Empire, 745-627 B.C." In M. T. Larsen, ed., *Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires*, pp. 223-250. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Bēl-ibni's Letters in the Time of Sargon and Sennacherib." *RA* 77 (1983) 175-176.

- Brinkman, J. A. "Documents Relating to the Reign of Aššur-nādin-šumi." *Or* 41 (1972) 245-248.
- Brinkman, J. A. "The Early Neo-Babylonian Monarchy." In P. Garelli, ed., *Le palais et la royauté*, pp. 409-415. Paris: Geuthner, 1974.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Elamite Military Aid to Merodach-Baladan." *JNES* 24 (1965) 161-166.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Foreign Relations of Babylonia from 1600 to 625 B.C.: The Documentary Evidence." *AJA* 76 (1972) 271-281.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Kandalānu." *RLA* 5 368-369.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Kudurru, A. Philologisch." *RLA* 6 267-274.
- Brinkman, J. A. *Materials and Studies for Kassite History*, vol. 1: *A Catalogue of Cuneiform Sources Pertaining to Specific Monarchs of the Kassite Dynasty*. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1976.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Merodach-Baladan II." In R. D. Biggs and J. A. Brinkman, eds., *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim*, pp. 6-53. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1964.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Mesopotamian Chronology of the Historical Period." In A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*, pp. 335-348. Revised edition completed by E. Reiner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Notes on Arameans and Chaldeans in Southern Babylonia in the Early Seventh Century B.C." *Or* 46 (1977) 304-325.
- Brinkman, J. A. *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia, 1158-722 B.C. (AnOr 43.)* Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Sennacherib's Babylonian Problem: An Interpretation." *JCS* 25 (1973) 89-95.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Settlement Surveys and Documentary Evidence: Regional Variation and Secular Trend in Mesopotamian Demography." *JNES* 43 (1984) 169-180.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Through a Glass Darkly: Esarhaddon's Retrospects on the Downfall of Babylon." *JAOS* 103 (1983) 35-42.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Ur: The Kassite Period and the Period of the Assyrian Kings." *Or* 36 (1969) 310-348.
- Brinkman, J. A. "Ur: 721-605 B.C." *Or* 34 (1965) 241-258.
- Brinkman, J. A. and Kennedy, D. A. "Documentary Evidence for the Economic Rise of Early Neo-Babylonian Society: A Survey of Dated Babylonian Economic Texts, 721-626 B.C." *JCS* 35 (1983) 1-90.
- Buccellati, G. and Biggs, R. D. *Cuneiform Texts from Nippur: The Eighth and Ninth Seasons. (AS 17.)* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Buchanan, B. *Catalogue of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum*, vol. 1: *Cylinder Seals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

- Burstein, S. *The Babyloniaca of Berossus*. (SANE 1/5.) Malibu: Undena, 1978.
- Calmeyer, P. Review of Ulf Jantzen, *Ägyptische und orientalische Bronzen aus dem Heraion von Samos*. In ZA 63 (1973) 123-133.
- Cameron, C. *History of Early Iran*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Caquot, A. "Une inscription araméenne d'époque assyrienne." In *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, pp. 9-16. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971.
- Carter, E. and Stolper, M. W. *Elam: Surveys of Political History and Archaeology*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1984.
- Civil, M. "Note sur les inscriptions d'Asarhaddon à Nippur." RA 68 (1974) 94.
- Clay, A. T. *Babylonian Business Transactions of the First Millennium B.C.* (BRM 1.) New York: 1912.
- Clay, A. T. *Legal and Commercial Transactions Dated in the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods Chiefly from Nippur*. (BE 8/1.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1908.
- Clay, A. T. *Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Babylonian Collection*. (YOS 1.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1915.
- Clay, A. T. *Neo-Babylonian Letters from Erech*. (YOS 3.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919.
- Cogan, M. "Asurbanipal Prism F: Notes on Scribal Techniques and Editorial Procedures." JCS 29 (1977) 97-107.
- Cogan, M. *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974.
- Cogan, M. "Omens and Ideology in the Babylon Inscription of Esarhaddon." In H. Tadmor and M. Weinfield, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*, pp. 76-87. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1963.
- Cogan, M. and Tadmor, H. "Ashurbanipal's Conquest of Babylon: The First Official Report—Prism K." Or 50 (1981) 229-240.
- Cogan, M. and Tadmor, H. "Cyges and Ashurbanipal: A Study in Literary Transmission." Or 46 (1977) 65-85.
- Combe, E. *Histoire du culte de Sin en Babylonie et en Assyrie*. Paris: Ceuthner, 1908.
- Contenau, C. *Contrats néo-babyloniens*, vol. I: *De Téglath-phalasar III à Nabonide*. (TCL 12.) Paris: Ceuthner, 1927.
- Crawford, V. E. "Nippur, the Holy City." *Archaeology* 12 (1959) 74-83.
- Dalley, S. "The *nār-banītu* Canal at Kish." RA 74 (1980) 189-190.
- Delaunay, J. A. *Nouvelle édition de A. B. Moldenke, Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New-York)*. Paris: Ceuthner, 1977.

- De Meyer, L. *Tell ed-Dēr*, vol. 3. Louvain: Peeters, 1980.
- Diakonoff, I. M. "A Babylonian Political Pamphlet from about 700 B.C." In H. Cüterbock and T. Jacobsen, eds., *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965*, pp. 343-349. (AS 16.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Dietrich, M. *Die Aramäer Südbabyloniens in der Sargonidenzeit (700-648)*. (AOAT 7.) Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.
- Dietrich, M. *Neo-Babylonian Letters from the Kuyunjik Collection*. (CT 54.) London: British Museum, 1979.
- Dietrich, M. "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte Babyloniens, I." WO 4 (1967-68) 61-103.
- Dietrich, M. "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte Babyloniens, II." WO 4 (1967-68) 183-251 and 5 (1969-70) 51-56.
- Dietrich, M. "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte Babyloniens, III." WO 5 (1969-70) 176-190.
- Dietrich, M. "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte Babyloniens, IV." WO 6 (1970-71) 157-162.
- van Dijk, J. "Die Inschriftenfunde." In H. Lenzen, XVIII. *vorläufiger Bericht über die von dem Deutschen Archäologischen Institut und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft aus Mitteln der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unternommenen Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka*, pp. 39-62. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1962.
- Donner, H. and Röllig, W. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. Rev. ed. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1969-73.
- van Driel, C. Review of S. Ahmed, *Southern Mesopotamia in the Time of Ashurbanipal*. *BiOr* 26 (1969) 367-368.
- Driver, C. R. "The Sale of a Priesthood." *JRAS* Centenary Supplement 1924 41-48.
- Dubberstein, W. H. "Assyrian-Babylonian Chronology (669-612 B.C.)." *JNES* 3 (1944) 38-42.
- Durand, J.-M. *Documents cunéiformes de la IV^e Section de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*, vol. 1: *Catalogue et copies cunéiformes*. Geneva and Paris: Librairie Droz, 1982.
- Durand, J.-M. "Note à propos de la date d'ABL 290." RA 75 (1981) 181-185.
- Durand, J.-M. "Les 'slave documents' de Merodach-Baladan." JA 267 (1979) 245-260.
- Durand, J.-M. *Textes babyloniens d'époque récente*. Paris: Éditions A.D.P.F., 1981.
- Ebeling, E. *Neubabylonische Briefe*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie, 1949.
- Edzard, D. O. "Kaldû." *RLA* 5 291-297.
- Elat, M. "Mesopotamische Kriegsrituale." *BiOr* 39 (1982) 5-25.
- Eph'al, I. *The Ancient Arabs: Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent, 9th-5th Centuries B.C.* Jerusalem and Leiden: Magnes Press and E. J. Brill, 1982.
- Eph'al, I. "'Arabs' in Babylonia in the 8th Century B.C." *JAOS* 94 (1974) 108-115.

- Eph'al, I. "On Warfare and Military Control in the Ancient Near Eastern Empires: A Research Outline." In H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*, pp. 88-106. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983.
- Eph'al, I. "The Western Minorities in Babylonia in the 6th-5th Centuries B.C.: Maintenance and Cohesion." *Or* 47 (1978) 74-90.
- Fales, F. M., ed. *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis*. (*Oriens Antiqui Collectio* 17.) Rome: Centro per le Antichità e la Storia dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente, 1981.
- Fales, F. M. *Censimenti e catasti di epoca neo-assira*. (*Studi economici e tecnologici* 2.) Rome: Centro per le Antichità e la Storia dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente, 1973.
- Fales, F. M. "Il taglio e il trasporto di legname nelle lettere a Sargon II." In O. Carruba, M. Liverani, and G. Zaccagnini, eds., *Studi orientalistici in ricordo di Franco Pintore*, pp. 49-92. Pavia: CJES, 1983.
- Falkner, M. "Die Eponymen der spätassyrischen Zeit." *AfO* 17 (1954-56) 100-120.
- Fecht, G. "Zu den Namen ägyptischer Fürsten und Städte in den Annalen des Assurbanipal und der Chronik des Asarhaddon." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo* 16 (1958) 112-119.
- Figulla, H. H. *Business Documents of the Neo-Babylonian Period*. (UET 4.) London: British Museum, 1949.
- Follet, R. "Une nouvelle inscription de Merodach-Baladan II." *Biblica* 35 (1954) 413-428.
- Frame, C. "Another Babylonian Eponym." *RA* 76 (1982) 157-166.
- Frame, C. "Babylonia 689-627 B.C.: A Political History." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. University of Chicago, 1981.
- Frame, G. "The 'First Families' of Borsippa during the Early Neo-Babylonian Period." *JCS* 36 (1984) 67-80.
- Fried, M. H. *The Notion of Tribe*. Menlo Park, California: Cummings, 1975.
- Frymer-Kensky, T. "The Tribulations of Marduk: The So-Called 'Marduk Ordeal Text.'" *JAOS* 103 (1983) 131-141.
- Cadd, C. J. "Babylonian Antiquities from the Alnwick Castle Collection." *The British Museum Quarterly* 16 (1951-52) 43-45.
- Cadd, C. J. "The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus." *AnSt* 8 (1958) 35-92.
- Cadd, C. J. "Inscribed Barrel Cylinder of Marduk-apla-iddina II." *Iraq* 15 (1953) 123-134.
- Cadd, C. J. "Inscribed Prisms of Sargon II from Nimrud." *Iraq* 16 (1954) 173-201.
- Cadd, C. J. *The Stones of Assyria*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1936.
- Cadd, C. J. et al. *Royal Inscriptions*. (UET 1.) London: British Museum, 1928.
- Carelli, P., ed. *Le palais et la royauté*. Paris: Geuthner, 1974.

- Carelli, P. "Les sujets du roi d'Assyrie." In A. Finet, ed., *La voix de l'opposition en Mésopotamie*, pp. 189-213. Brussels: Institut des Hautes Études de Belgique, n.d.
- Carelli, P. and Nikiprowetzky, V. *Le Proche-orient asiatique: Les Empires Mésopotamiens, Israël*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974.
- de Genouillac, H. "Texte de Sargon le jeune provenant des fouilles d'el-'ahymer." *RA* 10 (1913) 83-87.
- Cibson, J. G. L. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Cibson, McC. *The City and Area of Kish*. Coconut Grove, Florida: Field Research Projects, 1972.
- Cibson, McC. "Current Oriental Institute Excavations in Iraq." *BSMS* 3 (1982) 16-32.
- Gibson, McC. "Nippur under Assyrian Domination: 15th Season of Excavation, 1981-1982." In R. McG. Adams, ed., *The Oriental Institute 1981-82 Annual Report*, pp. 40-48. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1982.
- Cibson, McC., ed. *Uch Tepe*, vol. 1: *Tell Razuk, Tell Ahmed al-Mughir, Tell Ajamat*. Chicago and Copenhagen: Oriental Institute, etc., 1981.
- Gibson, McC.; Zettler, R.; and Armstrong, J. "The Southern Corner of Nippur: Summary of Excavations during the 14th and 15th Seasons." *Sumer*, forthcoming.
- Cibson, McC. et al. *Excavations at Nippur: Twelfth Season*. (OIC 23.) Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1978.
- de Goeje, M. J. "Zur historischen Geographie Babylonien." *ZDMG* 39 (1885) 1-16.
- Coetze, A. "Additions to Parker and Dubberstein's Babylonian Chronology." *JNES* 3 (1944) 43-46.
- Coetze, A. "Esarhaddon's Inscription from the Inanna Temple in Nippur." *JCS* 17 (1983) 119-131.
- Grayson, A. K. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. (TCS 5.) Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1975.
- Crayson, A. K. *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.
- Crayson, A. K. "The Chronology of the Reign of Ashurbanipal." *ZA* 70 (1980) 227-245.
- Crayson, A. K. "Königslisten und Chroniken, Akkadisch." *RLA* 6 86-135.
- Crayson, A. K. "Problematical Battles in Mesopotamian History." In H. Cüterbock and T. Jacobsen, eds., *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965*, pp. 337-342. (AS 16.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Crayson, A. K. "The Walters Art Gallery Sennacherib Inscription." *AfO* 20 (1963) 83-96.
- Greenfield, J. "Babylonian-Aramaic Relationship." In H.-J. Nissen and J. Renger, eds., *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn*, pp. 471-482. (*Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient* 1.) Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982.

- Gurney, O. R. "Three Contracts from Babylon." In M. Dandamayev *et al.*, *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff*, pp. 120-128. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1982.
- Hall, H. R. *Babylonian and Assyrian Sculpture in the British Museum*. Paris and Brussels: G. van Oest, 1928.
- Hallo, W. W. "Dating the Mesopotamian Past: The Concept of Eras from Sargon to Nabonassar." *BSMS* 6 (1983) 7-18.
- Hannoun, N. "Tell al-Seeb and Tell Haddad." *BSMS* 2 (1982) 5-6.
- Hansen, D. and Dales, G. "The Temple of Inanna Queen of Heaven at Nippur." *Archaeology* 15 (1982) 75-84.
- Hansman, J. F. "The Mesopotamian Delta in the First Millennium B.C." *Geographical Journal* 144 (1978) 49-61.
- Harper, P. O. "Five Clay Sculptures of the Neo-Babylonian Period." *Iranica Antiqua* 17 (1982) 65-84.
- Harper, R. F. *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the K(ouyunjik) Collection(s) of the British Museum*. 14 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1892-1914.
- Heidel, A. "The Octagonal Sennacherib Prism in the Iraq Museum." *Sumer* 9 (1953) 117-188.
- Heltzer, M. *The Suteans*. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1981.
- Hilprecht, H. V. *Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century*. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman, 1903.
- Höffken, P. "Heilszeitherrschererwartung im babylonischen Raum." *WO* 9 (1977-78) 57-71.
- Hrouda, B., ed. *Isin-Išān Bahriyāt*, vol. 1: *Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 1973-1974*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977.
- Hrouda, B., ed. *Isin-Išān Bahriyāt*, vol. 2: *Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 1975-1978*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981.
- Hrouda, B. "Zusammenfassender Vorbericht über die Ergebnisse der I. Kampagne in Isin Bahriyat/Isin." *Sumer* 29 (1973) 37-45.
- Hunger, H. "Das Archiv des Nabû-ušallim." *Bagh. Mitt.* 5 (1970) 193-304.
- Hunger, H. *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*. (AOAT 2.) Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.
- Hunger, H. *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk*, vol. 1. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1976.
- Hunger, H. and Hirsch, H., eds. *Vorträge gehalten auf der 28. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale in Wien 6.-10. Juli 1981*. (AfO Beiheft 19.) Horn, Austria: Ferdinand Berger, 1982.
- Hunger, H. and Kaufman, S. "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text." *JAOS* 95 (1975) 371-375.
- Jacobsen, T. *Salinity and Irrigation Agriculture in Antiquity*. (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 14.) Malibu: Undena, 1982.

- Jacobsen, T. "The Waters of Ur." *Iraq* 22 (1960) 174-185.
- Jacoby, F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* III C 1. *Aegypten-Geten* Nr. 608a-708. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
- Jakob-Rost, L. "Ein neubabylonisches Tontafelarchiv aus dem 7. Jahrhundert v.u.Z." *Forschungen und Berichte* 10 (1968) 39-62.
- Jakob-Rost, L. "Urkunden des 7. Jahrhunderts v.u.Z. aus Babylon." *Forschungen und Berichte* 12 (1970) 49-60.
- Jantzen, U. *Ägyptische und orientalische Bronzen aus dem Heraion von Samos*. (Samos 8.) Bonn: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1972.
- Joannès, F. "La localisation de Šurru à l'époque néo-babylonienne." *Semitica* 32 (1982) 35-43.
- Joannès, F. *Textes économiques de la Babylonie récente*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1982.
- Johns, C. H. W. *An Assyrian Doomsday Book or Liber Censualis of the District round Harran; in the Seventh Century B.C.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1901.
- Jordan, J. *Erster vorläufiger Bericht über die von der Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft in Uruk-Warka unternommenen Ausgrabungen*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1930.
- Kessler, K. "Zu den keilschriftlichen Quellen des 2./1. Jahrtausends v. Chr. über Dilmun." In D. T. Potts, ed., *Dilmun: New Studies in the Archaeology and Early History of Bahrain*, pp. 147-160. (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 2.) Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1983.
- Kienast, B. "Mitteilung von einer Tontafel mit altsüdarabischer Beschriftung." In H. Lenzen, XIV. *vorläufiger Bericht über die von dem Deutschen Archäologischen Institut und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft aus Mitteln der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unternommenen Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka*, pp. 43-44. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1958.
- King, L. W. *Babylonian Boundary-Stones and Memorial-Tablets in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 1912.
- Klauher, E. G. *Politisch-religiöse Texte aus der Sargonidenzeit*. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1913.
- Knudsen, E. E. "Fragments of Historical Texts from Nimrud, II." *Iraq* 29 (1967) 49-69 and pls. XIV-XXIX.
- Knudtzon, J. A. *Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott für Staat und königliches Haus aus der Zeit Asarhaddons und Asurbanipals*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1893.
- Koldewey, R. *Die Pflastersteine von Aiburschabu in Babylon*. (WVDOG 2.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1901.
- Koldewey, R. *Die Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa*. (WVDOG 15.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1911.
- Koldewey, R. *Das wieder erstehende Babylon*. 4th ed. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1925.

- König, F. W. *Die elamischen Königsinschriften*. (AfO Beiheft 16.) Craz: Ernst Weidner, 1965.
- Krückmann, O. *Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungstexte*. (TuM NF 2-3.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1933.
- Kyrieleis, H. "Babylonische Bronzen im Heraion von Samos." *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 94 (1979) 32-48.
- Labat, R. "Assyrien und seine Nachbarländer (Babylonien, Elam, Iran) von 1000 bis 617 v. Chr./Das neubabylonische Reich bis 539 v. Chr." In E. Cassin *et al.*, eds., *Die Altorientalische Reiche*, vol. 3, pp. 9-111. (Fischer Weltgeschichte 4.) Frankfurt am-Main: Fischer Bücherei, 1967.
- Labat, R. *Traité akkadien de diagnostics et pronostics médicaux*. 2 vols. Paris: Académie Internationale d'Histoire des Sciences, 1951.
- Laessle, J. *Studies on the Assyrian Ritual and Series bit rimki*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955.
- Lambert, W. C. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Lambert, W. C. *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic*. London: Athlone Press, 1978.
- Lambert, W. C. "An Eye-Stone of Esarhaddon's Queen and Other Similar Gems." *RA* 63 (1969) 65-71.
- Lambert, W. C. "A Neo-Babylonian Tammuz Lament." *JAOS* 103 (1983) 211-215.
- Lambert, W. G. "The Seed of Kingship." In P. Carelli, ed., *Le palais et la royauté*, pp. 427-440. Paris: Geuthner, 1974.
- Lambert, W. C. "Two Texts from the Early Part of the Reign of Ashurbanipal." *AfO* 18 (1957-58) 382-387.
- Landsberger, B. *Brief des Bischofs von Esagila an König Asarhaddon*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandse Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1965.
- Langdon, S. "Kandalānu and Ašurbanipal." *JRAS* 1928 321-325.
- Langdon, S. *Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912.
- Langdon, S. "The Religious Interpretation of Babylonian Seals and a New Prayer of Shamash-shum-ukin (BM. 78219)." *RA* 16 (1919) 49-68.
- Larsen, C. E. "The Mesopotamian Delta Region: A Reconsideration of Lees and Falcon." *JAOS* 95 (1975) 43-57.
- Larsen, C. E. and Evans, C. "The Holocene Geological History of the Tigris-Euphrates-Karun Delta." In W. C. Brice, ed., *The Environmental History of the Near and Middle East since the Last Ice Age*, pp. 227-244. London: Academic Press, 1978.
- Larsen, M. "Unusual Eponymy-Datings from Mari and Assyria." *RA* 68 (1974) 15-24.
- Layard, A. H. *Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon*. London: J. Murray, 1853.
- Layard, A. H. *The Monuments of Nineveh*. London: J. Murray, 1853.

- Layard, A. H. *A Second Series of the Monuments of Nineveh*. London: J. Murray, 1853.
- Leemans, W. F. "Kidinnu: un symbole de droit divin babylonien." In M. David *et al.*, eds., *Symbolae ad jus et historiam antiquitatis pertinentes Julio Christiano van Oven dedicatae*, pp. 36-61. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1946.
- Leemans, W. F. "Marduk-apal-iddina II, zijn tijd en zijn geslacht." *Jahrbuch van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"* 10 (1945-48) 432-455.
- Lehmann, C. F. *Šamašsumukin, König von Babylonien 668-648 v. Chr., inschriftliches Material über den Beginn seiner Regierung*. 2 vols. (Assyriologische Bibliothek 8.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1892.
- Leichty, E. "Bel-epuš and Tammartu." *AnSt* 33 (1983) 153-155.
- Leichty, E. "An Inscription of Aššur-etel-ilani." *JAOS* 103 (1983) 217-220.
- Lenzen, H. "The Ningišzida Temple Built by Marduk-apla-iddina II at Uruk (Warka)." *Iraq* 19 (1957) 146-150.
- Lenzen, H.; Falkenstein, A.; and Ludwig, W. *Vorläufiger Bericht über die von dem Deutschen Archäologischen Institut und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft aus Mitteln der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unternommenen Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka Winter 1953/54, Winter 1954/55*. Berlin: Cbr. Mann, 1956.
- Lenzen, H.; Ziegler, C.; and Kienast, B. *XIV. vorläufiger Bericht über die von dem Deutschen Archäologischen Institut und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft aus Mitteln der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unternommenen Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka Winter 1955/56*. Berlin: Cbr. Mann, 1958.
- Lenzen, H. *et al.* *XVIII. vorläufiger Bericht über die von dem Deutschen Archäologischen Institut und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft aus Mitteln der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unternommenen Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka Winter 1959/60*. Berlin: Cbr. Mann, 1962.
- Levine, L. D. *Geographical Studies in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros*. Reprint of articles in *Iran* 11 (1973) 1-27 and 12 (1974) 99-124. Toronto and London: Royal Ontario Museum and British Institute of Persian Studies, 1974.
- Levine, L. "Manuscripts, Texts and the Study of the Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions." In F. M. Fales, ed., *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions. New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis*, pp. 49-70. (*Orientalis Antiqui Collectio* 17.) Rome: Centro per le Antichità e la Storia dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente, 1981.
- Levine, L. "Sennacherib's Southern Front: 704-689 B.C." *JCS* 34 (1982) 28-58.
- Lewy, H. "Nitokris-Naqfa." *JNES* 11 (1952) 264-286.
- Lewy, J. "The Chronology of Sennacherib's Accession." In *Miscellanea orientalia dedicata Antonio Deimel annos LXX complenti*, pp. 225-231. (*AnOr* 12.) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1935.
- Lie, A. C. *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria*, part 1: *The Annals, Transliterated and Translated with Notes*. Paris: Geuthner, 1929.

- Lipiński, E. *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics*, vol. 1. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1975.
- Liverani, M. "Critique of Variants and the Titulary of Sennacherib." In F. M. Fales, ed., *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis*, pp. 225-257. (*Oriens Antiqui Collectio* 17.) Rome: Centro per le Antichità e la Storia dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente, 1981.
- Loud, C. *Khorsabad*, vol. 1. (*OIP* 38.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Loud, C. and Altman, C. B. *Khorsabad*, vol. 2. (*OIP* 40.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Luckenbill, D. D. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926-27.
- Luckenbill, D. D. *The Annals of Sennacherib*. (*OIP* 2.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924.
- Lutz, H. F. *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts*. (PBS 1/2.) Philadelphia: University Museum, 1919.
- Lutz, H. F. "The Warka Cylinder of Ashurbanipal." *University of California Publications* 9 (1927-31) 385-390.
- Lyon, D. C. *Keilschrifttexte Sargon's Königs von Assyrien (722-705 v. Chr.)*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1883.
- MacFadyen, W. A. and Vita-Finzi, C. "Mesopotamia: The Tigris-Euphrates Delta and Its Holocene Hammar Fauna" (with an appendix by J. E. Robinson). *Ceological Magazine* 115 (1978) 287-300.
- Maddin, R.; Muhly, J. D.; and Wheeler, T. S. "How the Iron Age Began." *Scientific American* 237/4 (Oct. 1977) 122-131.
- Madhlom, T. A. *The Chronology of Neo-Assyrian Art*. London: Athlone Press, 1970.
- Malbran-Labat, F. *L'armée et l'organisation militaire de l'Assyrie d'après les lettres des Sargonides trouvées à Ninive*. Geneva and Paris: Librairie Droz, 1982.
- Malbran-Labat, F. "La Babylonie du sud, du XII^e au VII^e siècle avant notre ère d'après deux ouvrages récents." *JA* 260 (1972) 15-38.
- Malbran-Labat, F. "Éléments pour une recherche sur le nomadisme en Mésopotamie au premier millénaire av. J.-C., 1: 'L'image du nomade.'" *JA* 268 (1980) 11-33.
- Malbran-Labat, F. "Nabû-bêl-šumâte, prince du Pays-de-la-Mer." *JA* 263 (1975) 7-37.
- Malbran-Labat, F. "Le nomadisme à l'époque néo-assyrienne." In J. Silva Castillo, ed., *Nomads and Sedentary Peoples*, pp. 57-76. Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1981.
- Manitius, K., trans. *Ptolemäus, Handbuch der Astronomie*. Foreword and Corrections by O. Neugebauer. 2 vols. Reissue. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1963.

- McCown, D. E. and Haines, R. C.; assisted by Hansen, D. P. *Nippur*, vol. 1: *Temple of Enlil, Scribal Quarter, and Soundings*. (*OIP* 78.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- McCown, D. E.; Haines, R. C.; and Biggs, R. D.; assisted by Carter, E. F. *Nippur*, vol. 2: *The North Temple and Sounding E*. (*OIP* 97.) Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1978.
- McEwan, C. J. P. "Agade after the Cutian Destruction: The Afterlife of a Mesopotamian City." In H. Hunger and H. Hirsch, eds., *Vorträge gehalten auf der 28. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale in Wien 6-10. Juli 1981*, pp. 8-15. (*AfO Beiheft* 19.) Horn, Austria: Ferdinand Berger, 1982.
- McEwan, C. J. P. "Late Babylonian Kish." *Iraq* 45 (1983) 117-123.
- Millard, A. R. "Another Babylonian Chronicle Text." *Iraq* 26 (1964) 14-35.
- Millard, A. R. "Some Esaraddon Fragments Relating to the Restoration of Babylon." *AfO* 24 (1973) 117-119.
- de Miroschedji, P. "Notes sur la glyptique de la fin de l'Élam." *RA* 76 (1982) 51-63.
- de Miroschedji, P. "Prospections archéologiques au Khuzistan en 1977." *DAFI* 12 (1981) 169-192.
- Moorey, P. R. S. *Ancient Iraq (Assyria and Babylonia)*. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1976.
- Moorey, P. R. S. *Kish Excavations 1923-1933, with a Microfiche Catalogue of the Objects in Oxford Excavated by the Oxford-Field Museum, Chicago Expedition to Kish in Iraq, 1923-1933*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Moritz, B. "Die Nationalität der Aramu-Stämme in Südost-Babylonien." In C. Adler and A. Ember, eds., *Oriental Studies Published in Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary (1883-1923) of Paul Haupt as Director of the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University*, pp. 184-211. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1926.
- Mullo-Weir, C. J. "The Return of Marduk to Babylon with Shamashumukin." *JRAS* 1929 553-555.
- Myhrman, D. *Babylonian Hymns and Prayers*. (PBS 1/1.) Philadelphia: University Museum, 1911.
- Nashef, K. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der mittelbabylonischen und mittelassyrischen Zeit*. (RCTC 5.) Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1982.
- Nashef, K. "Der Taban-Fluss." *Bagh. Mitt.* 13 (1982) 117-139.
- Nassouhi, E. "Prisme d'Assurbânipal daté de sa trentième année, provenant du temple de Cula à Babylone." *AfK* 2 (1924-25) 97-106.
- Nassouhi, E. "Textes divers relatifs à l'histoire de l'Assyrie." *MAOC* 3/1-2 (1927) 1-38.
- Nies, J. B. and Keiser, C. E. *Historical, Religious and Economic Texts and Antiquities*. (BIN 2.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920.

- Nöldeke, A. and Lenzen, H. *Elfter vorläufiger Bericht über die von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka unternommenen Ausgrabungen*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1940.
- Nöldeke, A. et al. *Achter vorläufiger Bericht über die von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka unternommenen Ausgrabungen*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1937.
- North, R. "Status of the Warka Excavation." *Or* 26 (1957) 185-256.
- Nougayrol, J. "Parallèles, duplicata, etc." *RA* 36 (1939) 29-40.
- Oates, J. "Assyrian Chronology, 631-612 B.C." *Iraq* 27 (1965) 135-159.
- Oates, J. *Babylon*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1979.
- Oded, B. *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1979.
- Olmstead, A. T. "Babylonia as an Assyrian Dependency." *AJS* 37 (1920-21) 212-229.
- Olmstead, A. T. "The Fall and Rise of Babylon." *AJS* 38 (1921-22) 73-96.
- Oppenheim, A. L. "Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts." In J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, pp. 265-317. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Oppenheim, A. L. "Essay on Overland Trade in the First Millennium B.C." *JCS* 21 (1967) 236-254.
- Oppenheim, A. L. *Letters from Mesopotamia: Official, Business, and Private Letters on Clay Tablets from Two Millennia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Oppenheim, A. L. "Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian Empires." In H. D. Laswell, D. Lerner, and H. Speier, eds., *Propaganda and Communication in World History*, vol. 1: *The Symbolic Instrument in Early Times*, pp. 111-144. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1979.
- Oppenheim, A. L. "'Siege Documents' from Nippur." *Iraq* 17 (1955) 69-89.
- Owen, D. and Watanabe, K. "Eine neubabylonische Gartenkaufurkunde mit Flächen aus dem Akzessionsjahr Asarhaddons." *Oriens Antiquus* 22 (1983) 37-48.
- Parker, B. "Administrative Tablets from the North-West Palace, Nimrud." *Iraq* 23 (1961) 15-67.
- Parker, R. A. and Dubberstein, W. H. *Babylonian Chronology: 626 B.C.-A.D. 75*. (Brown University Studies 19.) Providence: Brown University Press, 1956.
- Parpola, S. "Assyrian Library Records." *JNES* 42 (1983) 1-29.
- Parpola, S. "Assyrian Royal Inscriptions and Neo-Assyrian Letters." In F. M. Fales, ed., *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis*, pp. 117-142. (*Oriens Antiqui Collectio* 17.) Rome: Centro per le Antichità e la Storia dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente, 1981.
- Parpola, S. "A Letter from Šamaš-šumu-ukīn to Esarhaddon." *Iraq* 34 (1972) 21-34.

- Parpola, S. *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*, part 1: *Texts*. (AOAT 5/1.) Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.
- Parpola, S. *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*, part 2: *Commentary and Appendices*. (AOAT 5/2.) Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1983.
- Parpola, S. *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*, part 2A: *Introduction and Appendices*. (AOAT 5/2A.) Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1971.
- Parpola, S. "The Murderer of Sennacherib." In B. Alster, ed., *Death in Mesopotamia*, pp. 171-182. Gøbenhavn: Akademisk Forlag, 1980.
- Parpola, S. *Neo-Assyrian Letters from the Kuyunjik Collection*. (GT 53.) London: British Museum, 1979.
- Parpola, S. *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*. (AOAT 6.) Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.
- Parr, P. J. "Settlement Patterns and Urban Planning in the Ancient Levant: the Nature of the Evidence." In P. J. Ucko, R. Tringham, and C. W. Dingleby, eds., *Man, Settlement and Urbanism*, pp. 803-810. London: Duckworth, 1972.
- Parrot, A. *The Arts of Assyria*. New York: Golden Press, 1961.
- Paterson, A. *Assyrian Sculptures: Palace of Sennacherib*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1915.
- Peat, J. A. "Hanšā Land and the *rab hanšā*." *Iraq* 45 (1983) 124-127.
- Petschow, H. "Zur Forderungsabtretung im neubabylonischen Recht." *Eos* 48/2 (1957) 21-27.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. *State Letters of Assyria*. (AOS 6.) New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1935.
- Piepkorn, A. G. *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal*, vol. 1: *Editions E, B₁₅, D, and K*. (AS 5.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Pinches, T. G. *The Babylonian Tablets of the Berens Collection*. (*Asiatic Society Monographs* 16.) London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1915.
- Pinches, T. G. "Ein babylonischer Eponym." *Afo* 13 (1939-41) 51-54.
- Pinches, T. "The Fragment of an Assyrian Tablet Found at Gezer." *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* 1904 229-236.
- Pinches, T. G. "Notes upon Some of the Recent Discoveries in the Realm of Assyriology, with Special Reference to the Private Life of the Babylonians." *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 26 (1893) 123-171.
- Pinckert, J. *Hymnen und Gebete an Nebo*. Leipzig: August Pries, 1907.
- Pöhl, A. *Neubabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus den Berliner Staatlichen Museen*, vol. 2. (*AnOr* 9.) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1934.

- Porada, E. "Suggestions for the Classification of Neo-Babylonian Cylinder Seals." *Or* 16 (1947) 145-165.
- Postgate, J. N. "Assyrian Texts and Fragments." *Iraq* 35 (1973) 13-36.
- Postgate, J. N. "Royal Exercise of Justice under the Assyrian Empire." In P. Carelli, ed., *Le palais et la royauté*, pp. 417-426. Paris: Geuthner, 1974.
- Powell, M. A. "Merodach-Baladan at Dur-Jakin: A Note on the Defense of Babylonian Cities." *JCS* 34 (1982) 59-61.
- Prince, J. D. "A New Šamaš-šum-ukīn Series." *AJS* 31 (1914-15) 256-270.
- Rashid, F. "A Royal Text from Tell Haddad." *Sumer* 37 (1981) 72-80 (Arabic section).
- Ravn, O. E. "Sankerib af Assur's babylonske Politik." In J. Jacobsen, ed., *Studier tilegnede Professor, Dr. Phil. og Theol. Frants Buhl i anledning af hans 75 års Fødselsdag den 6 September 1925*, pp. 217-230. Copenhagen: V. Pios Boghandel-Povl Branner, 1925.
- Reade, J. "The Accession of Sinsharishkun." *JCS* 23 (1970-71) 1-9.
- Reade, J. "Assyrian Campaigns, 840-811 B.C., and the Babylonian Frontier." *ZA* 68 (1978) 251-260.
- Reade, J. "Kassites and Assyrians in Iran." *Iran* 16 (1978) 137-143.
- Reade, J. "Neo-Assyrian Monuments in Their Historical Context." In F. M. Fales, ed., *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis*, pp. 143-167. (*Orientalis Antiqui Collectio* 17.) Rome: Centro per le Antichità e la Storia dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente, 1981.
- Reiner, E. "The Babylonian Fürstenspiegel in Practice" (with an appendix by M. Civil). In M. Dandamayev et al., eds., *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff*, pp. 320-326. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1982.
- Reiner, E. "Inscription from a Royal Elamite Tomh." *Afo* 24 (1973) 87-102.
- Reuther, O. *Die Innenstadt von Babylon (Merkes)*. (WVDOG 47.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1926.
- Röllig, W. "Kisiga, Kissik." *RLA* 5 620-622.
- Rost, P. *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileasers III. nach den Papierabklatschen und Originalen Britischen Museums*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1893.
- Roux, G. "Recently Discovered Ancient Sites in the Hammar Lake District (Southern Iraq)." *Sumer* 16 (1960) 20-31.
- Sachs, A. "Babylonian Observational Astronomy." In F. R. Hodson, ed., *The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World*, pp. 43-50. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Sachs, A. *Late Babylonian Astronomical and Related Texts Copied by T. C. Pinches and J. N. Strassmaier*. Providence: Brown University, 1955.
- Safar, F. "Soundings at Tell Al-Laham." *Sumer* 5 (1949) 154-172.

- Saggs, H. "A Cylinder from Tell al Lahm." *Sumer* 13 (1957) 190-195.
- Saggs, H. "The Nimrud Letters, 1952, Part I." *Iraq* 17 (1955) 21-56.
- Saggs, H. "The Nimrud Letters, 1952, Part VI: The Death of Ukin-zer, and Other Letters." *Iraq* 25 (1963) 70-80.
- San Nicolò, M. *Babylonische Rechtsurkunden des ausgehenden 8. und des 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 1951.
- Scheil, V. "Notes d'épigraphie et d'archéologie assyriennes." *RT* 16 (1894) 90-92.
- Scheil, V. "Nouvelles notes d'épigraphie et d'archéologie assyriennes." *RT* 36 (1914) 179-192.
- Scheil, V. *Une saison de fouilles à Sippar*. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1902.
- Schiffer, S. *Die Aramäer: Historisch-geographische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1911.
- Schmidt, J. et al. *XXVI. und XXVII. vorläufiger Bericht über die von dem Deutschen Archäologischen Institut und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft aus Mitteln der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unternommenen Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka 1968 und 1969*. Berlin: Gehr. Mann, 1972.
- Schnabel, P. *Berosos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1923.
- Schollmeyer, A. *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen und Gebete an Šamaš*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1912.
- Seidl, U. "Die babylonischen Kudurru-Reliefs." *Bagh. Mitt.* 4 (1968) 7-220.
- Seux, M.-J. "L'auteur de BBSt n° XXXV." *RA* 54 (1960) 206-208.
- Seux, M.-J. *Épithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1967.
- Shea, W. H. "An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period, Part I." *AUSS* 9 (1971) 51-67 and 99-100.
- Smith, S. *The First Campaign of Sennacherib, King of Assyria, B.C. 705-681*. London: Luzac, 1921.
- von Soden, W. "Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und späthahylonischen Texten. Ein Vorbericht." *Or* 35 (1966) 1-20, 37 (1968) 261-271, and 46 (1977) 183-197.
- von Soden, W. "Aššuretililāni, Sīnšarriškun, Sīnšum(u)hēr und die Ereignisse im Assyrienreich nach 635 v. Chr." *ZA* 58 (1967) 241-255.
- von Soden, W. "Gibt es ein Zeugnis dafür, dass die Babylonier an die Wiederauferstehung Marduks geglaubt haben?" *ZA* 51 (1955) 130-166.
- von Soden, W. "Der neubabylonische Funktionär *sinmagir* und der Feuertod des Šamaš-šum-ukīn." *ZA* 62 (1972) 84-90.
- von Soden, W. "Ein neues Bruchstück des assyrischen Kommentars zum Marduk-Ordal." *ZA* 52 (1957) 224-234.

- von Soden, W. Review of D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings (626-556 B.C.) in the British Museum*. WZKM 53 (1956-57) 316-321.
- Sollberger, E. *Royal Inscriptions*, Part 2. (UET 8). London: British Museum, 1965.
- Spalinger, A. "Assurbanipal and Egypt: A Source Study." *JAOS* 94 (1974) 316-328.
- van der Spek, R. "The Struggle of King Sargon II of Assyria against the Chaldean Merodach-Baladan (710-707 B.C.)." *JEOL* 25 (1977-78) 56-66.
- Steinmetzer, F. X. *Die babylonischen Kudurru (Grenzsteine) als Urkundenform*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1922.
- Steinmetzer, F. X. "Die Bestallungsurkunde des Königs Šamaš-šum-ukīn von Babylon." In *Miscellanea orientalia dedicata Antonio Deimel annos LXX complenti*, pp. 302-306. (AnOr 12.) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1935.
- Steinmetzer, F. X. "Die Bestallungsurkunde Königs Šamaš-šum-ukīn von Babylon." *Archiv Orientální* 7 (1935) 314-318.
- Stephens, F. J. *Votive and Historical Texts from Babylonia and Assyria*. (YOS 9.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.
- Stigers, H. G. "A Neo-Babylonian Quit-Claim Deed." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 63 (1972-73) 171-174.
- Stolper, M. W. "šarnappu." *ZA* 68 (1978) 261-269.
- Strassmaier, J. "Einige kleinere babylonische Keilschrifttexte aus dem Britischen Museum." In *Actes du Huitième Congrès International des Orientalistes, tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiania*, II/IB, pp. 279-283, etc. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1893.
- Strassmaier, J. N. *Inschriften von Nabuchodonosor, König von Babylon*. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1889.
- Streck, M. *Die alte Landschaft Babylonien nach den arabischen Geographen*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1900-1901.
- Streck, M. *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's*. 3 vols. (VAB 7.) Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1916.
- Streck, M. "Die nomadischen Völkerschaften Babyloniens und des angrenzenden Elams." *MVAG* 11 (1906) 203-246.
- Tadmor, H. "An Ancient Scribal Error and Its Modern Consequences: The Date of the Nimrud Slab Inscription No. 1." *AnSt* 33 (1983) 199-203.
- Tadmor, H. "Autobiographical Apology in the Royal Assyrian Literature." In H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*, pp. 36-57. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983.
- Tadmor, H. "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study." *JCS* 12 (1958) 22-40 and 77-100.
- Tadmor, H. "Introductory Remarks to a New Edition of the Annals of Tiglath-Pileser III." *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, II/9 (1967) 168-187.

- Tadmor, H. "השוא של סרגון" *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958) 150-163.
- Tadmor, H. "Три последних десятилетия Ассирии." In *Труды Двадцать Пятого Международного Конгресса Востоковедов*, vol. 1, pp. 240-241. Moscow: Издательство Восточной Литературы, 1962.
- Tadmor, H. and Cogan, M. "Ahaz and Tiglath-Pileser in the Book of Kings: Historiographic Considerations." *Biblica* 60 (1979) 491-508.
- Thompson, R. C. *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon in the British Museum*. 2 vols. London: Luzac, 1900.
- Thompson, R. C. "A Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts from Nineveh (1927-32)." *Iraq* 7 (1940) 85-131.
- Toomer, G. J. *Ptolemy's Almagest*. London: Duckworth, 1984.
- Ucko, P. J.; Tringham, R.; and Dimpleby, C. W., eds. *Man, Settlement and Urbanism*. London: Duckworth, 1972.
- Unger, E. *Babylon: die heilige Stadt nach der Beschreibung der Babylonier*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1931.
- Ungnad, A. "Eponymen." *RLA* 2 412-457.
- Ungnad, A. "Figurenzauber für den kranken König Šamaš-šumu-ukīn." *Or* 12 (1943) 293-310.
- Vallat, F. *Suse et l'Élam*. Paris: Éditions A.D.P.F., 1980.
- Vita-Finzi, C. "Recent Alluvial History in the Catchment of the Arabo-Persian Gulf." In W. C. Brice, ed., *The Environmental History of the Near and Middle East since the Last Ice Age*, pp. 255-281. London, New York, and San Francisco: Academic Press, 1978.
- Wachsmuth, C. *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1895.
- Wäfler, M. *Nicht-Assyrer neuassyrischer Darstellungen*. (AOAT 26.) Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.
- Walker, C. B. F. *Cuneiform Brick Inscriptions in the British Museum, the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; the City of Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery; the City of Bristol Museum and Art Gallery*. London: British Museum, 1981.
- Walker, C. B. F. "Episodes in the History of Babylonian Astronomy." *BSMS* 5 (1983) 10-26.
- Walker, C. B. F. and Kramer, S. N. "Cuneiform Tablets in the Collection of Lord Binning." *Iraq* 44 (1982) 70-86.
- Watelin, L. C. *Excavations at Kish*, vol. 3. Paris: Ceuthner, 1930.
- Waterman, L. *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire*. 4 vols. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1930-36.
- Weidner, E. F. "Die älteste Nachricht über das persische Königshaus: Kyros I. ein Zeitgenosse Aššurbānāplīs." *AfO* 7 (1931-32) 1-7.

- Weidner, E. F. "Assurbānīpal in Assur." *AfO* 13 (1939-41) 204-218.
- Weidner, E. F. "Assyrische Beschreibungen der Kriegs-Reliefs Aššurbānāplis." *AfO* 8 (1932-33) 175-203.
- Weidner, E. F. "Hochverrat gegen Asarhaddon." *AfO* 17 (1954-56) 5-9.
- Weidner, E. F. "Keilschrifttexte nach Kopien von T. G. Pinches. Aus dem Nachlass veröffentlicht und bearbeitet. 1. Babylonische Privaturkunden aus dem 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr." *AfO* 16 (1952-53) 35-46.
- Weippert, M. "Die Kämpfe des assyrischen Königs Assurbanipal gegen die Araber." *WO* 7 (1973-74) 39-85.
- Weisberg, D. "The Length of the Reign of Hallušu-Inšušinak." *JAOS* 104 (1984) 213-217.
- Weissbach, F. "Zu den Inschriften der Säle im Palaste Sargon's II. von Assyrien." *ZDMG* 72 (1918) 161-185.
- Wetzel, F. *Die Stadtmauern von Babylon*. (WVDOG 48.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1930.
- Wetzel, F. and Weissbach, F. *Das Hauptheiligtum des Marduk in Babylon, Esagila und Etemenanki*. (WVDOG 59.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1938.
- Winckler, H. *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1889.
- Wiseman, D. J. *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (626-556 B.C.) in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 1956.
- Wiseman, D. J. "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon." *Iraq* 20 (1956) 1-99.
- Woolley, L. *The Kassite Period and the Period of the Assyrian Kings*. (UE 8.) London: British Museum, 1965.
- Woolley, L. *The Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods*. (UE 9.) London: British Museum, 1962.
- Woolley, L. *Ur 'of the Chaldees'*. Revised and Updated by P. R. S. Moorey. London: Herbert Press, 1982.
- Wright, H. "The Southern Margins of Sumer: Archaeological Survey of the Area of Eridu and Ur." In R. McC. Adams, *Heartland of Cities: Surveys of Ancient Settlement and Land Use on the Central Floodplain of the Euphrates*, pp. 295-345. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Zadok, R. "Arabians in Mesopotamia during the Late-Assyrian, Chaldean, Achaemenian and Hellenistic Periods Chiefly according to the Cuneiform Sources." *ZDMG* 131 (1981) 42-84.
- Zadok, R. *The Jews in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods according to the Babylonian Sources*. Haifa: University of Haifa, 1979.
- Zadok, R. "On Some Foreign Population Groups in First-Millennium Babylonia." *Tel Aviv* 6 (1979) 164-181.
- Zadok, R. *Sources for the History of the Jews in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods*. Jerusalem: Aqademon, 1979-80.

- Zadok, R. "The Toponymy of the Nippur Region during the 1st Millennium B.C. within the General Framework of the Mesopotamian Toponymy." *WO* 12 (1981) 39-69.
- Zawadzki, S. "The Economic Crisis in Uruk during the Last Years of Assyrian Rule in the Light of the So-Called Nabu-ušallim Archives." *Folia Orientalia* 20 (1979) 175-184.

GENERAL INDEX

References to a footnote alone are given in the form page-note (e.g., "47 n. 218"). References to a page and footnote are usually listed simply by the page number (e.g., "81") unless the footnote contains a significant discussion or might easily be missed, in which case a rubric such as "37 and n. 189" is employed. References to non-consecutive footnotes on a single page are punctuated by an intervening period (e.g., "nn. 463-465").

- Abiyate' 99, 103
 Abu Wadiya, Tell 8 n. 23
 Abydenos 118 n. 579
 Adab 8
 Adad 67 n. 317
 Adad-apla-iddina 13 n. 51, 75 n. 368
 Adile 41
 Adummatu 64
 Aegean 1
 Agade 76 n. 369; see also Akkad
 Ahigar 14 n. 54
 Ahlamu 12 n. 45, 95 n. 471
 Akkad 4 n. 6, 9 n. 26, 16 n. 62, 42 n. 203, 61 n. 295, 76 n. 369, 77 n. 375, 78 n. 379, 96 n. 474, 106 n. 526, 107 n. 534
 Akkadian period 6
 Akkadians 11
 Almagest 40 n. 197, 118
 Amlatu 20 n. 81
 Amorites 11
 Amukanur: see Bit-Amukani
 Amurru 31 n. 150, 95
 Anam 47 n. 218
 Anatolia 38 n. 191, 45, 46 n. 213
 ancestor cult 15 n. 60
 AN GAL 62 n. 296, 69 n. 329
 Anshan (*Anzan*) 63
 Arab, Arabs 8, 12 n. 41, 25, 27-28, 31 n. 150, 37, 46, 53 n. 249, 58, 57, 63 n. 307, 64, 71, 77, 79, 81, 90, 91, 95, 96, 99, 103-104, 105, 123; see also Arabia
 Arabia, Arabian 1, 19, 25, 31 n. 150, 34, 47, 93; see also Arabs
 Arabic, South 28
 Arahtu 67, 73 n. 357
 Aramaic (language) 14 and n. 53, 77 n. 375, 114, 119 n. 582, 124
 Arameans vii, 8, 9, 11, 12-14, 15 n. 59, 19, 20, 24, 29 n. 135, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 63, 78, 95, 101, 121, 123-124; see also Aramaic
 Arashi: see Rashi
 Arka(t)-ilani-damqa 38
 army, Babylonian 36-37 and *passim*
 Arrapha 43 n. 208, 97
 Ashur 107
 Ashurbanipal 21 n. 88, 26, 31 n. 150, 36, 37, 79, 81 n. 396, 82, 85-92, 93-104, 105-108, 113, 114, 115, 116 nn. 560-561, 119 n. 582, 127
 Ashur-beli-taqin 50 n. 231
 Ashur-etel-ilani 15 n. 60, 80 n. 388, 109 n. 548
 Ashur-etel(ii)-(ilani)-mukin-apli 69 n. 331
 Ashur-nadin-shumi 30 n. 146, 46 n. 214, 56, 60-61, 67, 68 n. 321, 69 n. 328, 72 n. 347, 78 n. 380, 84 n. 408, 126
 Ashurnasirpal II 56 n. 276
 Asia Minor 35 n. 177; see also Anatolia
 Assur 14 n. 53, 57, 63 n. 307, 67, 90, 114
 Assur Ostrakon 58 n. 273, 97 n. 484, 114, and *passim*
 Assyria, Assyrian(s) vii, 1 n. 1, 2, 9 n. 25, 11, 13 nn. 46-49, 14, 16, 18, 19-27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39-44, 45-65, 67-84, 85-92, 93-104, 105-111, 113-116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123-125, 126-127, and *passim*
 astronomy 26, 49, 89, 118 and *passim*
 Ayamu 99, 103

- Ay-ibur-shabu 56
 Babylon 1, 9 n. 26, 11 n. 36, 15, 16, 17 n. 72, 18, 21, 22, 23, 28, 32 n. 157, 33 n. 180, 34 n. 166, 41, 42, 43, 46 n. 215, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54 n. 250, 56, 57-58, 59, 80, 63-65, 67-80, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 94, 96, 97, 99-100, 106, 107 n. 534, 108, 109, 110, 111 n. 551, 115, 118 n. 580, 119, 120 n. 587, 125, and *passim*
 Babylon, mina of 35 n. 177
 Badrah 48
 Baghdad 19, 96
 Bahrain 67 n. 319
 Balatu 33 n. 160
 Banitu canal 70 n. 333, 116
 Basqanu 57
 Bavian 85 n. 313
 Bel-ahhe-eriba 46 n. 215
 Bel-emuranni 63 n. 306
 Bel-etir 90
 Bel-harran-bel-usur 39 n. 194
 Bel-ibni (king) 48 n. 214, 58, 58-60, 117, 126
 Bel-ibni (military commander) 99, 107
 Bel-iqisha 78, 80, 87, 92
 Berossos 10 n. 33, 90 n. 443, 105 n. 525, 106 n. 527, 118
 Bit-Adini 15 n. 59, 43
 Bit-Amukani 13 n. 49, 15, 23 n. 103, 24, 41 n. 200, 42, 58, 69, 81, 99, 107
 Bit-Dakkuri 9 n. 27, 15, 19, 20, 21 n. 86, 23 n. 103, 43, 51, 58, 80, 61 n. 295, 62, 76, 78, 79, 80, 99, 107
 Bit-Ha'iri 48 n. 223
 Bit-Imbi 101
 Bit-Sha'alli 15, 20 n. 81, 42, 58
 Bit-Shilani 15, 20 n. 81, 41 n. 200, 42 n. 203
 Bit-Yakin 8, 9 n. 26, 15, 19, 20, 23 n. 103, 25, 29, 43, 48, 50 n. 233, 54 n. 251, 58, 61, 72, 80-81, 97 n. 485
 Bit-Zeri 50 n. 233
 Borsippa 9 nn. 26-27, 11 nn. 36-39, 15, 17 n. 72, 18 n. 75, 22, 32 n. 157, 40, 49, 51, 53, 69, 74, 75, 77, 80, 63 n. 408, 87, 89, 90, 97, 99-100, 106, 108, 115
 Calah 40, 113
 calendar, Elamite 55 n. 258
 calendar, Julian 1 n. 1
 Carchemish 36
 Chaldea, Chaldean(s) vii, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 n. 52, 14-15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34 and n. 169, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45-65, 69, 72, 74, 75, 79, 80-81, 95, 96, 97, 103 n. 514, 107, 109 n. 548, 110 n. 551, 111, 121, 123-124, and *passim*
 "Chaldean" dynasty 110 n. 551
 Cilicia 36, 52 n. 242, 108
 Cimmerians 93, 94 n. 463
 city, Babylonian 17-18 and *passim*
 coinage 35 n. 177
 Commagene (Kummuhu) 20 n. 80, 36 n. 185, 45, 52
 Gutha 22, 29 n. 137, 34 n. 166, 37 and n. 189, 52 n. 242, 57-58, 77, 89 n. 437, 90, 95, 96, 97, 99-100, 108
 Cyrus 104 n. 519
 Damumu 20 n. 81
 demotic (Egyptian) script 119 n. 582
 deportation 19-20, 52 and n. 242, and *passim*
 Der 19, 21, 28 n. 134, 29 n. 137, 37 n. 189, 48, 62 n. 296, 69, 76
 Der, Tell ed- 119 n. 584
 Dilbat 9 n. 26, 11 n. 38, 18 n. 75, 32 n. 157, 42, 58 n. 275, 59, 80 n. 289, 88, 69 n. 437, 106, 108, 115
 Dilmun 31 n. 150, 67 n. 319
 Diru 20 n. 81
 Diyala region 4-8, 119, 122
 Djabbul 13 n. 46
 Dunanu 41, 92
 Dur-Athara 20 n. 81, 25 n. 111, 36, 51-52
 Dur-Kurigalzu 27 n. 123, 41
 Dur-Ladini 51 n. 237
 Dur-Nabu 52
 Dur-Sharruken 54 and n. 254
 Dur-Sharrukin 77; see also Dur-Sharruku
 Dur-Sharruku 22 n. 94; see also Dur-Sharrukin
 Duru 20 n. 81
 Dur-Untash 101
 Dur-Yakin 25 n. 111, 35, 36, 51-52 and n. 240
 Eanna 53, 75 n. 368, 88 n. 428
 Early Dynastic periods 6, 7 n. 16

- Ea-zera-iqisha 15
 Ebabbar 78 n. 380
 E-bāra-dūr-gar-ra 75 n. 368
 Edimgalkalama 69 n. 329
 Egibi 38
 Egypt, Egyptian 1, 18 n. 73, 75, 76 n. 368, 78 n. 380, 81 n. 397, 82, 86 n. 422, 87 n. 423, 93, 95
 Ekallate 67 n. 317
 Ekur 75 n. 368
 Elam, Elamite(s) vii, 1 n. 1, 2, 13, 19, 25, 27, 28-31, 34, 36, 37, 45, 46-51, 55 n. 258, 56, 57, 60, 61-65, 68 n. 324, 70 n. 334, 71, 72, 74, 76 n. 369, 77-79, 80, 81, 84 n. 408, 85 n. 411, 86, 87, 88, 90-92, 93-96, 98-104, 105, 107, 117, 121, 123, 126-127
 Elephantine 14 n. 54
 Ellipi 63
 Enlil (title) 53 n. 248
 Enlil-bani 92 n. 455
 eponymy, Babylonian 27 n. 123, 75 n. 367
 Eriba-Marduk 15 n. 61, 32 n. 157, 47
 Eridu 9 n. 30, 15 n. 58, 19 n. 78, 23, 28, 53, 62 n. 296, 95, 97
 Erimbuš 26 n. 116, 89 n. 440, 117
 Erra Epic 26 n. 117, 49 n. 230
 Esagila 74, 87 n. 427
 Esarhaddon 14 n. 54, 21 n. 88, 23, 27, 30, 50, 55 nn. 255-259, 67 n. 318, 66, 69 nn. 326-329, 331, 70-84, 85, 87, 90, 91, 105 n. 526, 107 n. 533, 113, 115 n. 560, 116 n. 581, 119 n. 582, 120 n. 587, 127
 Esharra-hamat 71 n. 343, 82
 Etemenanki 74
 Eulaeus 92
 Eulmash 69 n. 330
 Euphrates 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 13 n. 46, 15, 19, 25 n. 111, 46, 52 n. 240, 67, 73, 103, 119, 122
 family names 11 n. 38
 famine 9 n. 25, 91, 98, 99 n. 500
 Fars 63
 Fifty 32-33
 flooding, defensive 25 and n. 111
 Fürstenspiegel 22 n. 95
 Cahal (Cahul) 30 and n. 148, 38, 81
 Cambulu 13, 19, 21, 29, 34 n. 169, 51, 52, 78, 80, 87, 90, 91, 92, 94
 Cannanati 39 n. 194
 Germany 10 n. 35
 Gezer 94 n. 463
 glyptic 27, 121
 Creek 124 n. 603; see also Hellenistic
 Gula 120
 Curasimmu 95, 97
 Cutium 31 n. 150, 95
 Guzummanu 58 n. 272
 Cyges 93 n. 462
 Haddad, Tell 108
 Haditha 119 n. 584
 Haidalu 30, 92 n. 457, 100, 127 note
 Hallushu-Inshushinak 30 n. 146, 61-62, 126
 Halule 29, 37 n. 189, 63-64 and n. 307, 65 n. 313, 91
 Hamadan 19
 Hammar 119 n. 583
 Hamranu 41
 Hamrin 7 n. 19, 119
 Hararatu 32, 58
 Harimmu 59 n. 277
 Harran 34, 52 n. 242
 Harutu 58 n. 276
 Hazael 77
 Hebrew 77 n. 375
 Hellenistic (period) 10 n. 33, 110 n. 551, 118; see also Creek
 Heraion 121
 Hezekiah 57 n. 268
 Haidalu: see Haidalu
 Hilimmu 21, 101
 Hirimmu 32, 58, 59 n. 277
 Hirit 96
 Hor al-Hammar 60
 horticulture 26, 49, 117
 Humban-haltash I 126
 Humban-haltash II 29 n. 141, 30 n. 146, 72, 78-79, 92, 127
 Humban-haltash III 99, 101-103, 127
 Humban-nikash I (Ummannigash) 30 n. 148, 48, 51 n. 236, 126
 Humban-nikash II 92 n. 457, 99, 100-101, 127
 Humban-nimena 63-65, 126
 Hume: see Cilicia
 Hursagkalama 32 n. 157, 58 n. 275, 70, 108, 115 n. 558, 119

- Iltuk 99 n. 499
 Iltu-bani 33 n. 160
 Iltu-yada' 50 n. 231
 Imam Sayyid Shoka 5 n. 10
 Inanna 75 n. 368; see also Ishtar
 Indabibi (Indapipi) 99, 101, 127
 Indabigash: see Indabibi
 Iran, Iranian(s) 1, 59, 63, 104
 iron 36, 108, 115
 ironsmith 36
 Ishan al Howa 8
 Ishtar 22 n. 94, 70 n. 334, 76 n. 369, 105 n. 526, 120
 Ishtar-duri 55 n. 259
 Ishtar-hundu: see Shutur-Nahhunte
 Isin 8, 54 n. 250, 119 n. 584, 120
 Isin-Larsa period 6
 Islam 14
 Israelite(s) 18 n. 73
 Issur-Adad 99 n. 499
 Itu' 39 n. 194, 41 n. 202, 42 n. 203
 Jew(s) 18 n. 73
 Josephus 20 n. 80, 52 n. 242, 57 n. 268, 118
 Judah 1, 27, 45, 47, 57 n. 268, 93 n. 460
 Kandalanu 100 n. 502, 105-111, 118, 127
 Kar-Ashur 41
 Kashtiliashu IV 49 n. 229
 Kassite(s) 11, 59
 Kassite dynasty/period 3-7, 8 n. 23, 16 n. 62, and *passim*
 Kermanshah 19
 Kirbit 86, 90
 Kish 4 n. 6, 17 n. 69, 29, 32 n. 157, 37 n. 189, 49 n. 227, 50, 51 n. 234, 53 n. 250, 57-58, 70, 89 n. 437, 109, 115 n. 558, 116, 119, 121
 Kissik 15 n. 58, 19 n. 78, 23, 53, 95, 97
 Kisurra 5 n. 10
 Kudur-Nahhunte (II) 62-63, 126
 Kudurru 75 n. 368, 106 n. 526, 107
 Kullab 95, 97
 Kummuhu: see Commagene
 Kurash 104 n. 519
 Lahiru 21, 43 n. 208, 62 n. 301, 76 n. 371, 97
 Larak 15 n. 59, 107
 Larsa 5 n. 10, 15 n. 58, 19 n. 78, 53, 62, 76
 Larsa period 6
 Lita'u (Litamu) 42 n. 203
 Luristan 2
 Lydia 93
 Madaktu 30, 92 n. 457, 100, 101, 102
 Manasseh 93 n. 460, 118 n. 580
 Mankisu 96
 Marad 15 n. 57, 39 n. 194
 Marduk 22, 43, 53 n. 248, 63, 68, 69 n. 327, 73-74, 86, 87, 90, 109 n. 548
 Marduk-nadin-ahhe 67 n. 317
 Marduk-nadin-shumi 11 n. 36
 Marduk-shuma-ibni 92 n. 456
 Marduk-zakir-shumi II 23 n. 103, 57, 126
 marshes 24, 25 n. 111, and *passim*
 Medes 54 n. 252
 Mediterranean 1, 19, 34
 Meluhha 31 n. 150, 95
 Menanu: see Humban-nimena
 Merkes 68 n. 322
 Merodach-baladan II 15 n. 60, 17 n. 69, 19, 23 n. 103, 25 and n. 111, 26, 28, 29, 32 n. 157, 33, 36, 43, 45-53, 57-58, 59 n. 283, 60, 72 n. 349, 98, 116, 117, 119 n. 582, 126
 Middle Ages 10 n. 35
 "Middle Babylonian" period 3 n. 3, 5 n. 10
 mina of Babylon 35 n. 177
 Mukin-zeri 15 n. 61, 22, 23 n. 103, 42-43, 126
 Mushezib-Marduk 1 n. 1, 19, 21 n. 86, 23 n. 103, 25, 29, 60, 61 n. 295, 62-65, 67, 126
 Nabateans (Nabayatu) 31 n. 150, 103
 Nabonassar 10 n. 33, 16 n. 64, 39-42, 116, 118, 123, 126
 Nabonassar Era 40 n. 197
 Nabonidus 16 n. 62, 68 n. 325, 69 n. 330, 108 n. 545
 Nabopolassar vii, 3 n. 3, 27, 28 n. 125, 34 n. 165, 36, 58 n. 275, 71 n. 340, 106 n. 532, 109, 110, 111 n. 551, 119 n. 582, 123
 Nabu 22, 75 n. 368, 90
 Nabu-apla-iddin 111 n. 551
 Nabu-apla-usur: see Nabopolassar
 Nabu-balassu-iqbi 11 n. 38
 Nabu-bel-shumati 20 n. 82, 25, 29, 31 n. 150, 98-100, 102-103
 Nabu-mukin-zeri 42 n. 206; see Mukin-zeri
 Nabu-nadin-ahi 13 n. 46
 Nabu-nadin-zeri 16 n. 84, 42, 126
 Nabu-shar-ahhesu 103 n. 514

- Nabu-shuma-eresh 87, 92
 Nabu-shuma-ishkun 15 n. 61
 Nabu-shuma-ukin II 23 n. 103, 42, 126
 Nabu-zer-kitti-lishir 29 n. 139, 70, 72, 80
 Nadinu 13, 16 n. 64; see also Nabu-nadin-zeri
 Nagitu 60 and n. 286
 Na'id-Marduk 72, 80, 81 n. 392
 Namri 39 n. 194, 40
 Nanaya 22 n. 94, 70 n. 334, 103, 105 n. 526
 "Na-NE-ru" 13 n. 46
 Naqi'a 71 n. 343
 Natnu 103 n. 518
 Nebuchadnezzar II vii, 1, 27, 68 n. 322, 83 n. 407, 107 n. 532
 Nemed-Laguda 53
 Neo-Hittite 45
 Nergal 90
 Nergal-ushezib 23 n. 103, 30 n. 148, 61-62, 69 n. 329, 126
 Nina 98 n. 489
 Nineveh 26, 34 and n. 170, 54, 71 n. 342, 72, 75, 79, 87 n. 423, 103, 113
 Ningal-iddin 17, 18 n. 77, 70, 81, 84, 97 n. 483
 Ningishzida 49 n. 226
 Ninurta 88 n. 429
 Ninurta-kudurri-usur 39 n. 194
 Nippur 4-10, 11 n. 36, 12, 13, 17, 18 and n. 73, 23, 28, 31 n. 151, 32 n. 157, 36, 37, 41, 42, 51, 58 n. 275, 59, 62, 70, 75, 76, 78, 60, 87, 89 n. 437, 91, 92, 97, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110 n. 551, 114 n. 556, 115, 116 n. 581, 119, 120, 121 n. 596, 122
 Nubia 95
 Nummur(u) 33 n. 160
 Nuzi 32 n. 159
 Old Babylonian period 6-7
 Palestine 27, 45
 Palmyra 103
 Parsuash (Parsumash) 63, 104 n. 519
 Patak, Tepe 102 n. 513
 Peqod 13 n. 49
 Persepolis 101 n. 506
 Persia 104 n. 519; see also Iran
 Persian Gulf 1, 15, 19, 34, 60 n. 286, 67
 Phoenicia, Phoenician 28, 94 n. 463
 Pillatu (Pillutu) 21, 29 n. 135, 101
 Piqudu 13 n. 49; see Puqudu
 plague 9 n. 25, 39, 54 n. 251, 99
 population, maximum 4 n. 9
 Post-Kassite period 3 n. 3; 5 n. 10, 6, 81 n. 395, and *passim*
 province system 16-17, 21, and *passim*
 "Ptolemaic Canon" 40 n. 197, 62 n. 301, 69, 90 n. 443, 118
 Pul, Pulu 43 n. 209, 106 n. 529
 Puqudu 8, 13 and n. 49, 19, 22 n. 94, 42 n. 203, 43 n. 208, 53 n. 250, 70 n. 334, 75 n. 368, 95, 97, 98
 Qafa Dulu' 8
 Qedar, Qedarite(s) 26, 103
 Qin-Enlil/-Nippur 41 n. 201
 Qirbit: see Kirbit
 Que 52 n. 242
 Rab-bani family 58 n. 275
 Rabilu 41
 Rasā (Rasā) 48 n. 223
 Rashi (Arashi) 29 n. 135
 Rubu' 41 n. 202, 42 n. 203
 Ru'ua 13 and n. 46, 42 n. 203
 Sahritu 35 n. 176
 Sallayu 81 n. 397
 Samaria 34 n. 166, 45, 52 n. 242, 100 n. 504
 Samarra 63 n. 307
 Samgunu 13, 92
 Sammuges 90 n. 443, 105 n. 525
 Samoges 105 n. 525
 Samos 34 n. 165, 121
 Sarakos 110 n. 551
 Sardanapallos 105 n. 525, 106 n. 527
 Sargon II 13 n. 49, 20 n. 81, 21, 22, 25 n. 111, 26 n. 121, 27 n. 122, 31 n. 150, 38, 45-55, 58 n. 260, 57 n. 270, 59 n. 277, 62, 70 n. 338, 75 n. 368, 84 n. 409, 105 n. 526, 113, 115, 116 n. 581, 119 n. 582, 126
 Saturn 105 n. 521
 Sealand, Sealanders 15, 16 n. 62, 17, 20 n. 82, 43, 70, 72, 80, 93, 97, 98-99, 107, 110 n. 551
 seals 27, 121
 Seleucid period 7 n. 18, 110
 Semites 29 n. 135
 Semitic, East 12 n. 42
 Semitic, West 12
 Sennacherib 9, 13 n. 49, 18 n. 75, 20 n. 81,

- 21 n. 86, 23, 24, 26, 28, 31 n. 150, 34 and n. 166, 35 n. 177, 45, 46, 48 n. 223, 52 n. 242, 54-65, 67-72, 75 nn. 366, 368, 76, 77, 80, 83-84, 105 n. 526, 114, 115, 119 n. 582, 126
- Sha-amele: see Shamele
- Shala 67 n. 317
- Shalmaneser III 22
- Shalmaneser V 21 n. 84, 43, 45, 46, 46, 106, 126
- Shamash 78 n. 380, 90
- Shamash-dammanni 106 n. 526, 107 n. 534
- Shamash-ibni 15 n. 60, 79, 60, 81 n. 392, 109 n. 548
- Shamash-resh-usur 39 n. 194
- Shamash-sharru-ibni 54 n. 254
- Shamash-shum-ukin 1 n. 1, 20 n. 82, 22, 25, 26, 28, 30 n. 146, 31 n. 150, 37, 60 n. 289, 82, 85-92, 93-100, 103, 105, 106, 108 n. 543, 116, 117, 119 n. 582, 127
- Shamele 81
- Shamshi-ilu 39 n. 194
- Sha-pi-Bel 78
- Shapiya 41 n. 200, 42
- Sha-suru-Adad 99 n. 499; see Sha-usur-Adad
- Shat-iddin 95
- Sha-usur-Adad 59 n. 281, 117; see Sha-suru-Adad
- Shaznaku 109
- Shoka, Imam Sayyid 5 n. 10
- Shubria 76, 78 n. 380
- Shula 88
- Shulgi 47 n. 218
- Shuma 30 n. 148
- Shutruk-Nahhunte II 51 n. 236
- Shutur-Nahhunte 30 n. 148, 51, 57, 126
- Shuzubu 61 n. 295
- Shuzubu the Babylonian 61 n. 295; see Nergal-ushezib
- Shuzubu the Chaldean 60, 61 n. 295, 62 n. 301; see Mushezib-Marduk
- Sillaya 82
- Sin 98
- Sin-alik-pani 54 n. 254
- Sin-balassu-iqbi 18 and n. 77, 81 n. 394, 88, 117, 119
- Sin-shar-ishkun 109-110, 113 n. 553
- Sin-sharra-usur 88, 97 n. 483, 117
- Sin-shumu-lishir 18 n. 73, 109 n. 548, 110
- Sin-tabni-usur 97-98
- Sippar 4 n. 6, 9 n. 28, 11 nn. 36, 38, 17 n. 72, 23, 30, 41, 49, 53, 61, 78, 87, 89, 90, 91 n. 449, 96, 97, 99-100, 108, 114 n. 556, 115
- Sippar-Annunitu 69
- Sippar-Aruru 69 n. 330, 76
- Sirara 108
- Subarian(s) 47
- substitute king 81 n. 397, 82-83, 87 n. 426
- Sumer 16 n. 62, 42 n. 203, 61 n. 295
- Sumerian(s) 11, 49
- surveys, archeological 3-10, 11, 119, 122
- Susa 30, 92 n. 457, 100, 101, 102, 103
- Susiana 29 n. 135
- Sutians 12 n. 41, 31 n. 150, 53
- Syria 34, 36, 42, 45, 93, 94 n. 463, 95
- Tabal 46 n. 213, 54 n. 252
- Taban (*Taban*) 7 n. 19
- Tabua 77
- Tammaritu 30 n. 148
- Tammaritu (I) 92 n. 457, 100, 127 note
- Tammaritu (II) 99, 101, 127
- Targibatu 62 n. 298
- Taurus 45
- Tell Abu Wadiya 8 n. 23
- Tell ed-Der 119 n. 584
- Tell Haddad 106
- Tell Tuba 92
- Tema 26
- Ten 33 n. 160
- Tepe Patak 102 n. 513
- Teumman 91-92, 100, 127
- Tiglath-pileser III 13 n. 49, 15 n. 59, 20 n. 81, 26 n. 115, 35, 39-43, 45, 55 nn. 255, 259, 106, 114, 115, 126
- Tigris 3, 12, 21, 32, 39, 58, 63, (86), 90, 96
- timber (as export) 32
- titulary, Babylonian royal 16 n. 62
- Tuba, Tell 92
- Tukulti-Ninurta II 58 n. 276
- Uaite 103
- Ubaru 75
- Uhaimir 53 n. 250; see Kish
- Ululayu 43 n. 210, 106 n. 529
- Ummanigash: see Humban-nikash I
- Ur 4-10, 11 n. 37, 13 n. 46, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, 28, 38 n. 180, 52 n. 240, 53, 59 n. 283, 70, 72,

- 80-81, 84, 88, 89, 95, 96, 97-98, 106-107 n. 532, 114 n. 556, 115 n. 558, 117, 119, 120 n. 586
- Ur III period 6
- Urartu 40, 45
- Ur-Nammu 49 n. 226
- Urtagu, Urtagi: see Urtak
- Urtak 30 n. 146, 79 and n. 381, 86 n. 418, 87, 91, 127
- Uruk 4 n. 7, 5-10, 11 n. 37, 13, 15, 17 n. 69, 22 n. 94, 23, 28, 32 n. 157, 33 n. 160, 40, 49, 53, 58 n. 275, 60 nn. 288, 289, 61 n. 296, 62, 70, 75, 76, 87, 88, 89, 90 n. 442, 95, 97, 98, 100 n. 504, 103, 105 n. 526, 106, 107, 108, 110, 115, 116, 119, 120 n. 586, 122, 125
- Usur-Adad 59 n. 281
- Van, Lake 76
- Wasit 13
- wine 32
- Wüstungen* 10 n. 35
- Yada 13 n. 46
- Yakin, Yakinite: see Bit-Yakin
- Yamutbal 86
- Yashian 29 n. 135
- Yasubigalli 59
- Yat'pe 57
- Yauta 77
- Zababa Gate (Babylon) 57 n. 270
- Zabalam 5 n. 10
- Zagros 34, 45, 95
- Zakir-shumi 13
- Zakutu 71 n. 343
- Zame 97
- Zarpanitu 74 n. 359
- Zimjirli 82 n. 401

INDEX OF AKKADIAN WORDS

This is a selective list of Akkadian words (other than proper names) occurring in the text. For proper names, see the appropriate entry in the General Index.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <i>abullu</i> 63 n. 301, 64 n. 311 | <i>nakāru</i> 96 n. 474 |
| <i>adū</i> 21 | <i>nappāh parzilli</i> 36 |
| <i>aggīs</i> 65 n. 313 | <i>našiku</i> 13 |
| <i>aḫātu</i> : see <i>mār aḫāti</i> | <i>pagru</i> 64 n. 311 |
| <i>akītu</i> 26, 40, 67, 116 | <i>palū</i> 41 n. 200, 64 n. 311 |
| <i>ammātu</i> 32 n. 158 | <i>parzillu</i> 36 |
| <i>apī la mammani</i> 110 n. 551 | <i>pēthallu</i> 36 |
| <i>arki</i> 83 n. 405, 94 n. 463 | <i>pāḫatu</i> (NAM) 16, 107 n. 534(P) |
| <i>arū</i> 61 n. 293 | <i>pīru</i> 58 n. 275 |
| <i>bābu</i> 109 n. 548 | <i>pūtu</i> 32 n. 158 |
| <i>beḫēru</i> 77 n. 375, 95 n. 468 | <i>qēbiru</i> 64 n. 311 |
| <i>bīhirtu</i> 77 n. 375, 95 n. 468 | <i>qīpu</i> 107 |
| <i>bubātu</i> 64 n. 311 | <i>qu</i> 64 |
| <i>dannatu</i> 64 n. 311 | <i>rab bīti</i> 77 n. 375, 95 n. 468 |
| <i>dātu(m)</i> 29 n. 136 | <i>rab eširti</i> 33 n. 160 |
| <i>edel bābi</i> 109 n. 548 | <i>rab ḫanše</i> 32-33 |
| <i>edēlu</i> 63 n. 301, 64 n. 311 | <i>rab āmi</i> 33 n. 160 |
| <i>eširtu</i> 33 n. 160 | <i>rēš šarrūti</i> 72 n. 347, 73 n. 351 |
| <i>ešitu</i> 61 n. 295 | <i>ribitu</i> 64 n. 311 |
| <i>gannatu</i> 49, 117 | <i>saḫmaštu</i> 109 n. 548 |
| <i>ḫanšū</i> 32-33 | <i>seḫū</i> 63 n. 301 |
| <i>ḫarru</i> 33, 49 n. 228 | <i>sepīru</i> 14 n. 53 |
| <i>ḫušahḫu</i> 64 n. 311 | <i>sukkalmahḫu</i> 30 n. 148 |
| <i>isqu</i> 17 n. 71, 108, 115 | <i>sulummā</i> 79 |
| <i>istēt</i> 110 n. 550 | <i>sunqu</i> 64 n. 11 |
| <i>karmātu</i> 69 n. 330 | <i>šābē šālūti</i> 36 |
| <i>kišir šarrūti</i> 36 | <i>ša arki</i> 83 n. 405, 94 n. 463 |
| <i>kizū</i> 103 | <i>šakin māti</i> (GAR KUR) 17 n. 68, 106 n. 526, 107 n. 534 |
| <i>kšānu</i> 18 n. 73 | <i>šakin fēmi</i> 17, 75 n. 367 |
| <i>māḫāzu</i> 53 n. 248 | <i>šakkanakku</i> 17, 87 n. 426, 88 n. 430 |
| <i>mammāna</i> 110 n. 551 | <i>šaknu</i> 17, 107; see <i>šakin māti</i> |
| <i>mār aḫāti</i> 30 n. 148 | <i>šanat rēš šarrūti</i> 73 n. 351 |
| <i>māru</i> 11 n. 38 | <i>šandabakku</i> 17, 80 n. 390 |
| <i>masnaqtu</i> 33 n. 161 | <i>šar ḫammā'i</i> (LUGAL IM. GI) 61 n. 295 |
| <i>mašqū</i> 63 n. 307, 64 n. 308 | <i>šar pūhi</i> 82 |
| <i>minde</i> 65 n. 313 | <i>šāru</i> 64 n. 311 |
| <i>musukkannu</i> 32 | <i>šatammu</i> 88 n. 426 |
| <i>muššū</i> 64 n. 311 | <i>šattu</i> : see <i>šanat rēš šarrūti</i> |
| <i>mūšū</i> 64 n. 311 | <i>šbirtu</i> 35 n. 177 |
| <i>nabalkutu</i> 64 n. 308 | |

<i>šiddu</i> 32 n. 158	<i>ja'tu</i> 29 and n. 136
<i>širkūtu</i> 53 n. 250, 70 n. 334, 105 n. 526	<i>jūbu</i> 79
<i>šūt rēši</i> 92 n. 456	<i>ummānu</i> 14 n. 54
<i>tāmtu</i> 110 n. 551	<i>urbi</i> 28 n. 128
<i>tāru</i> 59 n. 278, 61 n. 295	<i>usurtu</i> 64 n. 311
<i>taγartu</i> 65 n. 313	<i>zu'uztu</i> 33 n. 161, 49 n. 227

